

7. Consultation and Coordination

7.1 Public Participation and Notification

The public participation and notification program for the EITP EIR/EIS focused on two primary areas under CEQA and NEPA; these areas were (1) the Public Scoping process and (2) the Draft EIR/EIS public review process. This section discusses the specific public scoping methods used for this EIR/EIS to comply with state and federal public outreach requirements.

7.1.1 Scoping Process

Scoping Requirements

Scoping is required by CEQA for projects of “statewide, regional or area-wide significance” per §21083 of the California Public Resources Code and by NEPA pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality 1979 regulations (40 CFR 1501.7). This process ensures that significant public issues, alternatives, and impacts are addressed in environmental documents and determines the scope and degree to which these issues and impacts will be analyzed.

Scoping for Proposed Project EIR/EIS

The scoping process for the EITP EIR/EIS consisted of the following four main elements:

1. Publication of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) to prepare an EIR and the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS.
2. Establishment of public information repositories for scoping and project documents, including a website and an electronic mail address for comments.
3. Hosting of public scoping meetings and an inter-agency consultation meeting.
4. Documentation of all public and agency comments received in a Scoping Summary Report.

These elements are described in the following sections.

As part of the project approval process and in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA, the public scoping process was intended to allow the public, interested parties and regulatory agencies an opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIR/EIS and to identify issues that should be addressed in the document. Federal, state, regional, and city agencies; Native American tribes and communities; businesses; and interested groups and individuals were given the opportunity to participate in the scoping process by providing comments and recommendations at the scoping meetings or via the EITP scoping comment repositories.

7.1.1.1 Notices of Preparation and Intent

NOP/NOI Requirements

After deciding that an EIR/EIS is needed, both the state and federal lead agencies are required to prepare and distribute a notice informing interested parties that an EIR or EIS, respectively, will be prepared. CEQA requires that the state lead agency prepare an NOP, and NEPA requires that the federal lead agency prepare an NOI. The NOP and NOI are prepared to inform interested parties about the proposed project and to solicit their participation in the EIR/EIS scoping process.

CEQA states that an NOP be sent “immediately after deciding that an environmental impact report is required for the project” (15082[a]) and include “sufficient information describing the project and the potential environmental effects to enable the responsible agencies to make a meaningful response” (15082[a][1]). Similar to an NOP, an NOI is published by the lead federal agency to serve as the official legal notice that an EIS is being prepared for a project (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1501.7). The NOI must include a description of the proposed project and possible alternatives, the federal lead agency’s scoping process, and the lead agency’s contact information for the project (40 CFR 1508.22).

NOP/NOI for the Eldorado–Ivanpah Transmission Project EIR/EIS

Pursuant to the state and federal requirements discussed above, an NOP and an NOI were distributed for the EITP. The CPUC provided an NOP to the California State Clearinghouse for release on July 23, 2009. The NOP was mailed to 133 government agencies, as well as 96 residents and nongovernmental organizations to inform the public of the proposed project and provide notice of the public scoping meetings. The BLM published an NOI for NEPA in the Federal Register on July 27, 2009.

The NOP and NOI are provided as an appendix to the Scoping Summary Report in Appendix E of this EIR/EIS.

7.1.1.2 Scoping Meetings

Scoping Meeting Requirements

CEQA recommends that public scoping be combined to the extent possible with consultation with responsible agencies, as required under 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) 15802. Consultation is conducted with agencies that will be involved in the environmental review process locally, as well as state and federal agencies and tribal governments, as appropriate.

When public scoping is conducted, NEPA requires that public meetings be conducted in accordance with statutory requirements and other criteria (e.g., consideration of the interest in or environmental controversy of the proposed project; 40 CFR 1506.6[c]).

Scoping Meetings

The CPUC and the BLM conducted joint public scoping meetings along the proposed route in Nipton, California, on Tuesday, July 28, 2009, and in Las Vegas, Nevada, on Wednesday, July 29, 2009 (Table 7.1). The format for the scoping meetings included an open house, a PowerPoint presentation describing the EITP, and an opportunity to provide verbal or written comments.

Table 7.1 Public Scoping Meetings

Date and Time	Location	No. of People Signed-in	Comments Received at Meeting
Tues., July 28, 2009, 4–7 p.m.	Primm Valley Golf Club, Nipton, CA	3	0
Wed., July 29, 2009, 6–9 p.m.	South Point Hotel, Las Vegas, NV	7	0

An open house was held for one hour prior to each scoping meeting so that participants could review displays, maps, and literature, as well as meet members of the EIR/EIS project team, agency staff, and project personnel. To encourage public comment, repositories were provided to receive written comments. Several informational sheets about the proposed project and extra copies of the NOP/NOI were made available to the public at each venue.

Each scoping meeting began with presentations by the CPUC and the BLM describing their roles as lead agencies under the CEQA/NEPA processes, followed by an overview of the technical aspects of the proposed project. This included a detailed presentation of the current route, accompanied by an explanation of the project need. Lastly, the

1 environmental consulting firm preparing the EIR/EIS for the CPUC and the BLM explained its role as third-party
2 consultant, discussed opportunities for public involvement, and provided an overview of the environmental issues
3 already identified that would be addressed in the EIR/EIS.
4

5 Each meeting concluded with a public comment period in which the agencies invited the public to comment verbally
6 on the project. A court reporter was available to record comments. Participants were also given the opportunity to
7 provide written comments or to take a comment form to fill out and mail in later. Attendees were encouraged to take
8 additional comment forms with them to distribute. Nine persons attended the two meetings.
9

10 The following handouts and informational materials were available at the public meetings:
11

- 12 • Public scoping and public involvement overview
- 13 • Scoping meeting fact sheets
- 14 • NOP copies
- 15 • NOI copies
- 16 • Electric transmission information
- 17 • Project overview
- 18 • Noise and electric and magnetic fields (EMF) information
- 19 • Project overview and Public scoping and public involvement overview also available in Spanish
20

21 **Alternatives Screening**

22 The range of alternatives evaluated in the alternative screening process was identified through the CEQA/NEPA
23 scoping process and through supplemental studies and consultations that were conducted during this analysis. The
24 range of alternatives considered in the screening analysis comprised (1) alternatives identified by the applicant as
25 part of the Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA), (2) alternatives requested by the CEQA lead agency
26 (CPUC) or the NEPA lead agency (BLM), and (3) alternatives identified by the general public during the 30-day public
27 scoping period (July 23 to August 26, 2009), in accordance with CEQA and NEPA requirements. The Alternatives
28 Screening Report (Appendix A) provides a detailed discussion of the alternatives screening process.
29

30 **7.1.1.3 Scoping and Alternatives Reports Summaries**

31 **Scoping Report Summary**

32 In accordance with 40 CFR 1503.4, which requires that all substantive comments be considered to the extent feasible
33 prior to project decisions, comments received during the scoping period were categorized by issue and included in a
34 comprehensive scoping summary report entitled *Southern California Edison Eldorado-Ivanpah Transmission Project*
35 *Scoping Summary Report*, issued and made available on the CPUC website for the project in October 2009
36 (Appendix E). The report summarized the comments and issues raised during the scoping period between July 27
37 and August 26, 2009.
38

39 Four primary areas of concern were identified during the public scoping process: (1) impacts of the project on several
40 biological resources, especially desert tortoise, (2) compatibility with regional land uses such as the planned Southern
41 Nevada Supplemental Airport, (3) compatibility with other existing rights-of-way designations, and (4) cumulative
42 impacts.
43

44 **Alternatives Screening Report Summary**

45 As a result of the alternatives screening process, seven of the initial 17 alternatives were chosen for detailed analysis
46 in the EIR/EIS. Chapter 2 describes each alternative considered for analysis, in detail, and provides a determination
47 for each based on the advantages and disadvantages identified from the screening criteria, as detailed in the
48 Alternatives Screening Report (Appendix A).
49

1 **7.1.2 Notice of Availability**

2
3 CEQA Guidelines Section 15085 requires that a Notice of Completion (NOC) be filed by the lead state agency upon
4 completion of the Draft EIR. The NOC informs the reviewers that a Draft EIR is complete. Similarly, NEPA requires
5 that a Notice of Availability (NOA) that corresponds to the NOC be filed by the lead federal agency once the EIR/EIS
6 is available for public review (40 CFR 1506.10). The NOC is filed with the State Clearinghouse. An NOA of the Draft
7 EIR/EIS must also be published in the Federal Register. An NOA for the Draft ISEGS Final Staff Assessment / Draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register.

10 **7.1.3 Draft EIR/EIS Public Hearings / Meetings and Comments**

11 Public Hearings/ Meetings Requirements

13 NEPA requires that federal agencies allow no less than 45 days for comments on a draft EIS. Under CEQA
14 Guidelines, section 15105, subd. (a), the “public review period for the draft EIR should not be less than 30 days nor
15 longer than 60 days except in unusual circumstances.” The 45-day public comment period for the Draft EIR/EIS that
16 was published April 30, 2010, concluded June 26, 2010, meeting both the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. As
17 stated above, the NOA described information regarding the 45-day public review period and included notice of public
18 meetings on May 26, 2010.

19
20 The purpose of the Draft EIR/EIS public hearings/meetings was to disclose the environmental effects of the proposed
21 transmission line, describe alternatives to the proposed action under consideration in the decision making process
22 and provide interested parties with an opportunity to submit oral and written comments to the Draft EIR/EIS.

23
24 Public Hearings/Meetings

25 The CPUC and the BLM conducted joint public comment meetings along the proposed route in Nipton, California and
26 Las Vegas, Nevada on Wednesday, May 26, 2010 (Table 7.2). The format for the public meetings included a
27 PowerPoint presentation describing the findings of the environmental analysis. Comment cards were provided to
28 encourage public verbal or written comment to the Draft EIR/EIS and informational sheets about environmental
29 impacts of the proposed project were made available to the public at each venue.

30 **Table 7.2 Public Meetings**

<u>Date and Time</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>No. of People Signed-in</u>	<u>Comments Received at Meeting</u>
Wed., May 26, 2010, 1–3 p.m.	Primm Valley Golf Club, Nipton, CA	5	0
Wed., May 26, 2009, 6–8 p.m.	Jean Sport Aviation Center, Las Vegas, NV	3	0

31
32 The joint public meetings were recorded and entered into the public record. Each public meeting included
33 presentations by the CPUC and the BLM describing the purpose and preparation stages of the EITP EIR/EIS under
34 the CEQA/NEPA process followed by a description of other local and state entities which contributed to the
35 preparation of the document. The environmental consulting firm provided a technical overview of the project objective
36 and components including a description of the proposed route, alternatives and “Whole of the Action/Cumulative
37 Action” assessment. An overview of the impact analysis and Draft EIR/EIS findings of significance was explained
38 emphasizing impacts that were categorized as significant or major adverse. Lastly the meetings concluded with a
39 comment session for attendees.

40
41 Each meeting included a period for public comment where agencies invited the public to provide verbal or written
42 input. A court reporter was available to record comments, and comment forms were provided to make comments to
43 be mailed-in at a later date. Eight persons attended the two meetings. No verbal or written comments were submitted
44 prior to June 26, 2010, close of the comment period.

1 The following factsheets and informational materials were made available at the public meetings:
2

- 3 • Project Overview
- 4 • Public Comment Process
- 5 • Draft EIR/EIS Findings
6

7 To ensure that the review of the Draft EIR/EIS was conducted in a timely manner, efforts were made for the
8 document to be readily available to the public in both electronic and paper formats described below in 7.1.4,
9 Document Repository Sites.

10 DEIR-EIS Draft Comments

11 Following the release of the Draft EIR/EIS, concerned citizens, interested parties and governmental agencies were
12 given the opportunity to review and comment on the findings of the document. Comments ranged from requests for
13 clarification on the applicant's project description to requests for additional resource-specific information for several
14 resource sections (e.g., air quality, biology, hazards and safety, and land use), comments on the Whole of the Action /
15 Cumulative Action approach, and comments on the range of project alternatives. Comments were received from the
16 following governmental entities:
17

- 18 • US Environmental Protection Agency;
- 19 • California Department of Fish and Game;
- 20 • California Department of Transportation;
- 21 • California Department of Toxic Substances Control;
- 22 • California State Lands Commission;
- 23 • Clark County Department of Aviation;
- 24 • Mojave Dessert Air Quality Management District; and
- 25 • Nevada Department of Wildlife.
26

27 Comments were received from the following interested parties:
28

- 29 • BrightSource Energy;
- 30 • Center for Biological Diversity, San Francisco Office;
- 31 • Desert Conservation Program;
- 32 • Powers Engineering;
- 33 • Sierra Club;
- 34 • Southern California Edison; and
- 35 • Western Watersheds Project.
36

37 **7.1.4 Document Repository Sites**

38 Document Repository Site Requirements

39 Both CEQA and NEPA require the state and federal lead agencies to make project documents available to the public.
40 CEQA CCR Section 15087 provides requirements that apply to the public review of the Draft EIR. NEPA 40 CFR
41 1506.6(f) states that the lead federal agency is required to "make environmental impact statements, the comments
42 received, and any underlying documents available to the public pursuant to the provisions of the Freedom of
43 Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552)." In addition, CEQA requires that the California Energy Commission (CEC) / BLM
44 ISEGS Final Staff Assessment / Draft EIS (FSA/DEIS), the BLM FEIS, the CEC FSA Addendum, and the CEC Errata
45 to the FSA Air Quality Addendum—referenced and included within the document—~~incorporated herein by reference,~~
46 also be made available to the public per CCR Section 15150(b).
47
48
49

Public Repository Sites

To accommodate public review, copies of the EITP Draft and Final EIR/EIS, and documents produced during the course of the environmental review process, are available for public review at the Las Vegas BLM Field Office; ~~and at the Las Vegas Library, located at 833 Las Vegas Boulevard North, in Las Vegas, Nevada;~~ Searchlight Library, 200 Michael Wendell Way, Searchlight, NV 89046; and Barstow Library, 301 E Buena Vista Street, Barstow, CA 92311. Project information is also posted on the CPUC website at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/ene/ivanpah/ivanpah.html> and the BLM website at <http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/needles.html>.

The ISEGS Final Staff Assessment / Draft Environmental Impact Statement is available for review on the California Energy Commission website at <http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/ivanpah/index.html> or the BLM's website at http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/needles/neo_nepa.html. Copies are also available for review at the Needles BLM Field Office and the BLM California State Office in Sacramento.

7.1.5 Project Notification List and Document Distribution List

Ecology and Environment, Inc., (E & E) compiled a comprehensive mailing list for the EITP that included approximately 229 entries. E & E used the mailing list to distribute the NOP and scoping meeting postcards. The mailing list was updated to include individuals who attended the scoping meetings or requested inclusion on the list after the initial mailing of the NOP and the postcard. E & E will use this mailing list to distribute subsequent notices, information, or documents, as applicable. E & E ~~will continue to updated~~ the mailing list as new entries became ~~become~~ available. No new entries were made into the mailing list for the public hearing/meetings of the DEIR/EIS.

The mailing list includes the following categories:

- Federal, state, and local agency representatives;
- Representatives of non-governmental organizations;
- Native American tribal government representatives; and
- List of property owners within 300 feet of the EITP footprint from Southern California Edison.

7.2 Organizations and Persons Consulted

CEQA guideline 15129 states, "The EIR shall identify all federal, state, or local agencies, other organizations, and private individuals consulted in preparing the draft EIR, and the persons, firm, or agency preparing the draft EIR, by contract or other authorization." Parties consulted in preparation of the EIR/EIS are listed in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2 Organizations and Persons Consulted

Name	Title	Organization/Agency
<i>Air Quality</i>		
Alan De Salvio	Supervising Air Quality Engineer	Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District
<i>Biological Resources</i>		
Michael Burroughs	Lead Tortoise Biologist	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Becky Jones	Environmental Scientist	California Department of Fish and Game
Lawrence Whalon	Deputy Superintendent	Mojave National Preserve
Brad Hardenbrook	Supervisory Biologist	Nevada Department of Wildlife (Southern Region)
Roddy Shepard	Roddy Shepherd	Nevada Department of Wildlife
<i>Public Services and Utilities</i>		
Michael R. Richardson	Supervisor/Compliance and Enforcement Branch	Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (Bureau of Waste Management)
Mark Harris	Resource Planning Engineer	Nevada Public Utilities Commission

Table 7.2 Organizations and Persons Consulted

Name	Title	Organization/Agency
<i>Clark County Desert Conservation Program</i>		
Susan Wainscott	Adaptive Management Coordinator/Project Manager	Clark County Desert Conservation Program
<i>Land Use</i>		
Dionicio Gordillo	Principal Planner	Clark County Department of Planning
Jacquelyne Brady	Town Manager	Town of Laughlin, Managers Office
Carrie Hyke	Supervising Planner	San Bernardino County Planning Department
<i>Socioeconomics</i>		
Brok Armantrout	Director	Boulder City Community Development
<i>Transportation and Aviation</i>		
David Kessler (AWP-610.1)	Environmental Protection Specialist	FAA Western Pacific Region, Airports Division
Dan Kopulsky	Senior, Special Studies and IGR/CEQA	California Department of Transportation
Robert Tweedy	Airport Development Administrator	Clark County Department of Aviation
Teresa Motley	Airport Planning Manager	Clark County Department of Aviation
Mark Silverstein	Principal Planner	Clark County Department of Aviation
Tucker Field	Management Analyst II	Clark County Department of Aviation
Scott Thompson	Consultant	Trison Consulting (for CCDOA)
Catherine van Heuven	Consultant	Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell LLP (for CCDOA)

7.3 Preparers and Contributors

Persons from the lead agencies (the CPUC and the BLM) involved in the review of the EIR/EIS are listed in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3 Lead Agency Project Team

Name	Title	Agency
Monisha Gangopadhyay	Project Manager	California Public Utilities Commission
Jason Reiger, Esq.	Attorney	California Public Utilities Commission
Nicholas Sher	Attorney	California Public Utilities Commission
Tom Hurshman	Project Manager	Bureau of Land Management
George R. Meckfessel	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	Bureau of Land Management
Mike Ahrens	Recreation and Wilderness Staff Chief	Bureau of Land Management
<u>Sandra McGinnis</u>	<u>Planning and Environmental Coordinator</u>	<u>Bureau of Land Management</u>
<u>Thomas Stewart</u>	<u>Wildlife Biologist</u>	<u>Bureau of Land Management</u>
<u>Rolla Queen</u>	<u>Archaeologist</u>	<u>Bureau of Land Management</u>
Mona Daniels	Wilderness Specialist	Bureau of Land Management
Ken Downing	Geologist/Hydrologist	Bureau of Land Management
Larry LaPre	Wildlife Biologist	Bureau of Land Management
Sally Murray	Archaeologist	Bureau of Land Management
Everett Bartz	Weeds/Range Management	Bureau of Land Management
Mark Chandler	Realty Specialist	Bureau of Land Management
Jeff Steinmetz	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	Bureau of Land Management
Suzanne Rowe	Archaeologist	Bureau of Land Management
Sarah Peterson	Hydrologist	Bureau of Land Management
<u>Jayson Barangan</u>	<u>Wildlife Biologist</u>	<u>Bureau of Land Management</u>
Lisa Christianson	Air Quality Specialist	Bureau of Land Management
Beth Ransel	Assistant Field Manager	Bureau of Land Management

- 1 Persons who prepared or participated in the preparation of the EIR/EIS are listed in Table 7.4. Preparers' qualifications are also included.
- 2

Table 7.4 EIR/EIS Preparers and Reviewers

Name	Title (Years of Experience) Degree/Expertise	Sectioned Authored/Role
Tom Dildine	Environmental Planner (20 Years) MS, Environmental Science BA, Landscape Architecture	Aesthetics and Visual Resources
Annie Menon	Environmental Engineer (4 Years) MS, Environmental Engineering BS, Civil Engineering	Air Quality
Paul Van Kerkhove	Air Quality Engineer (20 Years) MS, Environmental Science/ Engineering BS, Chemical Engineering	Air Quality
Dru Krupinsky	Greenhouse Gas Specialist (5 Years) BA, Environmental Studies/Planning	Air Quality; Greenhouse Gases
Tina Willis	Environmental Planner (22 Years) BA, Economics/Urban Planning	Alternative Screening Report
Kim Zuppiger	Environmental Planner (18 Years) BA, Social Ecology	Alternative Screening Report; Health, Safety, and Hazards
Julie Watson	CEQA/NEPA Specialist (16 Years) MS, Landscape Ecology and Management BS, Biological Sciences and Ecology Executive Certificate, Sustainable Management	Alternatives Summary; Socioeconomics; Population and Housing; Growth-Inducing Impacts; Other Considerations
Ilja Nieuwenhuizen	Ecologist (10 Years) BS, Ecology, Behavior and Evolution	Biological Resources
Jason Zoller	Ecologist (10 Years) MS, Biology BS, Fisheries and Wildlife	Biological Resources
Jennifer Siu	Aquatic Ecologist (12 Years) MS, Environmental Engineering BA, Biology	Biological Resources
Mike Donnelly	Senior Environmental Specialist (23 Years) MEM, Environmental Management BS, Applied Biology Certified Professional Wetland Scientist	Biological Resources
Paul Smith	Ecologist (25 Years) BS, Range Science	Biological Resources
Ed Woch	Ecologist, Biologist (5 Years) MA; Geography BA; Social Science	Biological Resources
Christine McCollum	Environmental Specialist (8 Years) BA, Anthropology	Consultation and Coordination; Public Scoping; Recreation; Cultural Resources; Executive Summary
Sandra Pentney	Cultural Resource Specialist (9 Years) MA, Archeology Registered Professional Archeologist	Cultural Resources
Tim Gross	Cultural Resource Specialist (30 Years) PhD, Anthropology	Cultural Resources
Travis Whitney	Environmental Specialist (7 Years) BS, Geography	Cumulative Impacts

Table 7.4 EIR/EIS Preparers and Reviewers

Name	Title (Years of Experience) Degree/Expertise	Sectioned Authored/Role
Louise Flynn	Environmental/Public Health Scientist (23 Years) MPH, Public Health MES, Environmental Studies BA, Biology and Society	Cumulative Impacts; Noise, Public Services and Utilities
Daniel Shapiro	Planner (3 Years) BA, Spanish	Cumulative Impacts; Alternatives Summary
Erica Brown	Environmental Specialist (5 Years) BA, English	Deputy Project Manager; Hydrology and Water Quality; Public Services and Utilities; Aesthetics and Visual Resources; Cumulative Impacts; Purpose and Need
Cheryl Karpowicz	Vice President/Environmental Planner (36 Years) BA, Interdepartmental Studies Certified Planner, AICP	EIR/EIS Principal Review
Jim Harries, PE	Electrical Engineer (38 Years) BS, Electrical Engineering	Electrical Interference and Hazards
Mark Roeder	Certified Paleontologist (28 Years) BA, Anthropology	Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontology
Dale Schneeberger, PG	Principal Geologist (30 Years) MS, Geology BS, Geology BA, Biology	Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontology
Tom Ferraro	Hydrogeologist (30 Years) MS, Geology BS, Earth Science	Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontology; Hydrology and Water Quality
Amber Lauzon	GIS Analyst (8 Years) MA, Geography BS, Geology	GIS
Debbie Linton	Geographer (19 Years) BA, Geography	Graphics
Brenda Powell	Ecologist (14 Years) MS, Environmental Biology BS, Biology	Hazards, Health, and Safety
Robin Clemens	Chemist (23 Years) BA, Chemistry	Hazards, Health, and Safety
Stephanie Buss	Hazards Specialist/Toxicologist (13 Years) MS, Environmental Health BS, Environmental Science	Hazards, Health, and Safety
Emily Doren	Environmental Specialist (7 Years) BA, Geology	Hydrology and Water Quality; <u>Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontology</u>
Conor Doyle	Environmental Specialist (2 Years) BA, Political Science	Land Use; Recreation; Cumulative Impacts
Howard Levine	Environmental Planner (29 Years) MPS, Natural Resource Policy/Planning BA, Geography	Land Use; Recreation; Transportation and Traffic; Purpose and Need
Rachel Wilkinson	Technical Editor/Writer/Planner (7 Years) BA, English	Lead Technical Editor; Land Use; Transportation and Traffic Hazards, Health, and Safety; Scoping Report; Consultation and Coordination
Barry Epstein	CEQA/NEPA Legal Expert (25 Years) JD, University of Michigan Law School MPP, Masters of Public Policy BS, Business Administration	Legal Expertise

Table 7.4 EIR/EIS Preparers and Reviewers

Name	Title (Years of Experience) Degree/Expertise	Sectioned Authored/Role
Tom Siener	Certified Industrial Hygienist (32 Years) BS, Biology	Noise
Silvia Yanez	Environmental Specialist (7 Years) MS, Development and Environment MS, Environmental Management BS, Chemical Engineering	Project Description and Alternatives
Jennifer Rouda	Environmental Scientist (12 Years) MS, Earth Sciences BS, Geology/Chemistry	Project Manager
Rob Peterson	Technical Writer (8 Years) PhD, Education BS, Communication	Public Services and Utilities; Other Environmental Considerations
Lauren Eisele	CEQA/NEPA Specialist (22 Years) BS, Geology/Environmental Studies	Senior Review; Health, Safety, and Hazards; Land Use; Transportation and Traffic; Recreation
Alexis Amaye-Hunter	Environmental Planner (5 Years) MSPH, Environmental Health BA, Political Science/Spanish	Socioeconomics
Amy DiCarlantonio	Planner (13 Years) MSc; City Design and Social Science BA; Art History	Socioeconomics; Whole of Action/ISEGS; Biological Resources; Air Quality; and Hydrology and Water Quality
Ian Miller	Economist (21 Years) MS, Economics BA, Economics/Political Science	Socioeconomics
Anita Wahler	Technical Editor/Writer (18 Years) BS, Environmental Education/Biology	Technical Editor
Nick Figone	Planner (4 Years) BA, Political Science/Philosophy	Transportation and Traffic