

# Chapter 5

---

## Consultation, Coordination, Preparation



## 5.0 Introduction

As outlined by FWS policy, the NEPA, and CEQ regulations for implementation (40 CFR 1500-1508), developing both a CCP and an EIS are collaborative processes. This chapter summarizes the FWS's efforts to involve the public; other agencies; and local, state and tribal governments in compiling the CCP/EIS. Consultation beyond the planning stage and for stepdown plans will continue to address concerns, issues and opportunities of mutual interest.

### 5.1 Agency Consultation and Coordination

In the course of developing the CCP and completing the NEPA analysis, the FWS contacted a number of federal, state and local agencies to gather information, solicit input on the issues of concern, and invite their continued involvement as a 'cooperating agency.' In general, cooperating agencies are defined as having: 1) authority over the proposed action;<sup>169</sup> 2) jurisdiction by law;<sup>170</sup> or 3) special expertise with respect to the environmental impacts expected to result from the implementation of the CCP or from which the FWS could benefit as it developed the CCP/EIS.<sup>171</sup> The FWS held its first cooperating agency meeting on August 13, 2002, to provide information on the Monument and the CCP/EIS process, answer questions, and discuss what it means to be a cooperating agency as per NEPA/CEQ requirements.

Due to the high level of interest by area tribal governments, the FWS provided for tribal participation on the cooperating agency team as 'consulting governments.' This is in addition to, not a substitute for, agency-to-agency consultation (see below).

Fifteen agencies and/or governments elected to become cooperating agencies or consulting governments—the city of Richland, Adams County, Benton County, Grant County; WDOE, WDFW, WDNR, ACOE, BOR, BPA, DOE, Federal Highway Administration; BOR, CTUIR, Nez Perce, and Yakama Nation.

A total of fourteen cooperating agency meetings have been held to date. The FWS, cooperating agencies, and consulting governments convened to gather and exchange information; provide technical

---

<sup>169</sup> An agency has discretionary authority if it has the ability to add conditional measures as part of the proposed action's approval.

<sup>170</sup> An agency has jurisdiction by law if it has the authority to approve, veto, or finance all or part of the proposed action.

<sup>171</sup> An agency has special expertise if it has statutory responsibility (not approval authority), agency mission, or related program experience with regard to the proposed action.

input; coordinate the NEPA process; ensure compliance with laws and existing plans; write sections of the plan; and review and comment on internal drafts. All participants were encouraged to attend FAC meetings, public meetings, and public workshops.

## 5.2 Monument Federal Advisory Committee

In January of 2001, the Secretary of the Interior chartered the FAC, subject to the guidelines and provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (41 CFR Parts 101-6 and 102-3). The FAC was created to provide local advice to the FWS and DOE on development of the CCP/EIS for the Monument.

The original 13-member FAC (see Appendix G) was comprised of one person each representing the state, county government, city government, Native American tribes, public utilities, economic development, the environmental community, outdoor recreation, education, and the public-at-large; and three members representing the scientific community. The FAC was re-chartered in January of 2003 to include nineteen members, although new members were never appointed. The DOI allowed the FAC to sunset on January 10, 2005.

The FAC held twenty meetings between June 2001 and January 2005. The FAC used the meetings to formulate advice for the FWS and DOE about CCP/EIS-related topics such as public involvement strategies, planning issues, vision, goals, objectives, alternatives and special issues including White Bluffs slumping and elk population management. Each meeting was open to the public, with public comments taken at a specified time. Meeting dates were published in the *Federal Register* and sent to local and regional media outlets prior to each meeting. Committee records can be accessed at the WSU's Tri-Cities campus library in the DOE Reading Room. Minutes of each FAC meeting are posted on the Monument's web site. FAC records are also documented on a General Services Administration website, including meeting minutes, FAC advice to the FWS and DOE, FAC accomplishments, and committee operating costs.

## 5.3 Consultation with Native American Governments

Throughout the planning process, and in accordance with FWS and NEPA policy, the FWS has consulted with the four federally recognized Native American tribes in the area—the CTUIR, CCT, Nez Perce Tribe, and Yakama Nation. In addition, the FWS has consulted with the Wanapum Band. Although the Wanapum are not a federally recognized tribe because they did not negotiate a treaty with the United States, they historically occupied lands within the Monument and maintain traditional connections to the Monument to this day.

The FWS initiated consultation on the CCP with a March, 2002, letter of invitation to participate in the CCP/EIS planning process. Consultations continued on a regular basis. Following are the consultations and meetings to date:

**CCT**

July 2002  
 July 2003  
 October 2003

**CTUIR**

April 1999  
 June 1999  
 June 2001  
 July 2001  
 August 2001  
 October 2002  
 November 2002  
 February 2003  
 April 2003  
 May 2003  
 July 2003  
 January 2004  
 August 2004  
 October 2004

**Yakama Nation**

July 1999  
 May 2001  
 June 2001  
 January 2002  
 May 2002  
 June 2002  
 July 2002  
 January 2003  
 July 2003  
 September 2003  
 January 2004  
 February 2004  
 June 2004

**Wanapum**

October 2002  
 July 2003  
 April 2003

**Nez Perce Tribe**

June 1999  
 June 2001  
 September 2001  
 October 2001  
 June 2002  
 November 2002  
 March 2003  
 April 2003  
 July 2003  
 April 2004  
 September 2004

## 5.4 Formal Scoping

Prior to developing an EIS, the scope of the document—that is, what will be covered and in what detail—must be determined. Scoping is open to the public and state and local governments, as well as to affected federal agencies. This open process gives rise to important opportunities for better and more efficient NEPA analyses and simultaneously places responsibilities on public and agency participants alike to surface their concerns early.

The scoping period has specific objectives: 1) to identify the affected public and agency concerns; 2) to identify those concerns early in the EIS process; 3) to facilitate an efficient EIS preparation process, through the assembly of cooperating agencies, assignment of EIS development/writing tasks, ascertainment of all the related permits and reviews that must be scheduled concurrently, and establishment of time frames; 4) to define the issues and alternatives that will be examined in detail in the EIS, while simultaneously devoting less attention and time to issues which cause no concern; and 5) to save time in the overall process by helping to ensure that draft statements adequately address relevant issues, reducing the possibility that new comments will cause a statement to be rewritten or supplemented.

Scoping can lay a firm foundation for the rest of the decision-making process. If the EIS can be relied upon to include all the necessary information for formulating policies and making rational choices, the agency will be better able to make a sound and prompt decision. In addition, if it is clear that all reasonable alternatives are being seriously considered, the public will usually be more accepting of the choice among them. Sometimes the scoping process enables early identification of a few serious problems with a proposal, which can then be resolved or the proposal modified as the proposal is still being developed.

As undertaken by the Monument, scoping is a process, not an event or a meeting. It has continued throughout the planning and development of this EIS; public comments have been welcomed at any time throughout EIS/CCP development.

### 5.4.1 *Notice of Intent*

The FWS began the public scoping period by publishing a Notice of Intent to prepare the CCP in the *Federal Register*, on June 12, 2002. The FWS subsequently extended the initial ninety-day comment period by thirty days to end October 12, 2002. In addition to basic information about the CCP/EIS project, the notice provided information on the planning process; public involvement opportunities; tribal government involvement; the FAC and their role in the CCP; a history of the Monument; an explanation of the Monument's purpose as described in the Monument Proclamation; a description of the initial issues, concerns and opportunities as developed by the FWS and FAC; and a description of recent land use and planning efforts.

### ***5.4.2 Other Public Notices***

The planning team sent an initial news release to all local media contacts in television, newspaper, radio and other mass media outlets (e.g., organization newsletters). A week prior to each of the four public scoping meetings (see below), the planning team sent a public service announcement to the mass media contacts with specific information on the meeting location and meeting format.

Additionally, the planning team made telephone calls prior to each meeting to elected and government officials, area residents, and organizations interested in the Monument to remind them of the meeting. At the same time, the planning team sent a public notice via email to a distribution list of people and organizations interested in receiving information on the Monument. The FWS also mailed Planning Update #1, which announced the meetings, to those in the DOE Hanford mailing data base in August, 2002.

### ***5.4.3 Public Scoping Meetings***

Four public scoping meetings and one Monument open house were held during the 120-day comment period. During that time, FWS staff accepted official comments via: 1) oral comments captured on flipcharts at the scoping meetings; 2) emails or letters sent to the FWS Regional (Portland, Oregon) or Monument Offices; 3) completion of worksheets in a Planning Workbook; 4) telephone calls to the Monument Office; and/or 4) completion of a comment sheet included in Planning Update #1. All comments gathered during the period were recorded and summarized in a Public Scoping Report, which is available on the Monument's web site. The date and place of each of the four meetings were:

- August 28, 2002, Mattawa High School, Mattawa, Washington.
- September 5, 2002 Seattle Airport Radisson Hotel, Seattle, Washington.
- September 9, 2002 Washington State University Tri-Cities Campus, Richland, Washington.
- September 17, 2002 Yakima Convention Center, Yakima, Washington.

Public comments received since the close of the official public scoping period in October 2002, have been noted and compiled with those previously collected.

## **5.5 Additional Scoping and Other Sources of Input**

The FWS has given approximately sixty public presentations highlighting the CCP/EIS project. Audiences include the WDFW; DOE; EPA; PNNL; Energy Northwest; TNC; Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society; Government Accountability Project; Richland Public Facilities Commission; Tri-Cities Economic Development Council; Commissioners of Adams, Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties; Kennewick Community Education; the Native Plant Society of Washington; Partners for Arid Lands Stewardship; Kiwanis Clubs; Rotary Clubs; Hanford Retirees; Tri-Cities Visitor and Convention Bureau; B-Reactor Museum Association; teacher workshops, FWS lectures at refuges and training sessions; Hanford Communities; Hanford Advisory Board; city of Mattawa; and Richland Rod and Gun Club. Many presentations included a PowerPoint program, a traveling exhibit display, distribution of brochures and planning updates, and question and answer opportunities. Thoughts and issues brought forth by the public and/or agency personnel at these presentations have been used in development of the CCP.

Tours of the Monument were organized for numerous interested organizations and individuals—tribes, Washington congressional representatives, Tri-City Herald Editorial Board, WDFW, CRITFC, Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission, and local farmers and ranchers. These tours provided the FWS with valuable input for use in development of the CCP.

The FWS also conducted internal resource reviews on visitor services, wildlife and habitat, cultural resources, and geological and paleontological resources. In addition to FWS staff, the FWS assembled teams of resource experts from local, state and federal agencies and tribes to assist with the resource reviews.

### ***5.5.1 Elk Summit***

One of the biggest challenges facing the Monument is the management of the Rattlesnake Hills Elk Herd. Multiple jurisdictions and intermingled land ownerships have contributed to complex management challenges related to the herd. The WDFW and FWS hosted a workshop on April 5-6, 2004, in Prosser, Washington, to address these challenges. The two-day “Elk Summit” was attended by tribal representatives, county commissioners, the DOE, environmental groups, fish and wildlife professionals, and local farmers and ranchers.

The goals of the workshop were three-fold: 1) establish open lines of communication among all parties interested in management of the elk herd; 2) share updated facts, such as elk population numbers, habitat quality, and agricultural losses; and 3) identify potential herd management actions that could be taken to reduce losses. There was no expectation that all issues would be resolved during this meeting; however, the WDFW and FWS believed that accomplishing the above goals would be of great value in the cooperative management of the elk herd.

The Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG) was invited to assist with the workshop.<sup>172</sup> The process designed by the CBSG began with tasks designed to increase appreciation of each other's perspectives and to focus initially on problem analysis rather than solutions. Over the course of the two days, exact concerns of all parties were identified, a range of possible solutions were discussed, and positive next steps were agreed upon. These results, and a complete workshop summary, are available on the Monument's web site. The outcome of the workshop will be used in the development of the step-down Wildlife and Habitat Management Plan.

## 5.6 Planning Workshops

The FWS conducted three public planning workshops that brought together a diverse group of interests to develop drafts of the Monument's vision statement, goals, preliminary management alternatives, and management objectives. The workshops were designed as three-day sessions, each building on the progress from the previous workshop and feedback from the FAC. The CBSG designed and conducted these workshops. Approximately fifty people participated in each of the workshops. Final workshop reports can be found on the Monument's web site.

## 5.7 Planning Updates and News Releases

The FWS distributed five planning updates (summarized below) to individuals, agencies and organizations on the Monument's mailing list, which originally contained over 800 entries—1,300 by the end of the public comment period.<sup>173</sup>

- Planning Update 1: August 2002, provided an overview of the CCP process.

---

<sup>172</sup> The CBSG, based at the Minnesota Zoo, is one of over 100 specialist groups within the Species Survival Commission, which is itself one of six commissions comprising the World Conservation Union. Founded in 1948 and headquartered in Switzerland, the World Conservation Union unites 980 government agencies and non-governmental organizations across 140 countries to address worldwide environmental issues. The CBSG specializes in process design and facilitation of workshops to develop management plans for endangered species or conservation issue. CBSG workshops bring together all the stakeholders to find common ground and understanding on management of a species, a refuge, or an issue of ecological concern.

<sup>173</sup> Subsequent to the close of the draft CCP/EIS comment period, the FWS sent a letter to all mailing list entries asking them to respond back if they would like to remain on the Monument's distribution list. A self-addressed postcard was included to facilitate responses. Based on the responses, the Monument mailing/distribution list has been reduced by two-thirds to approximately 420 individuals and organizations (Appendix U). It is expected that this will increase with release of the final CCP.

- Planning Update 2: July 2003, presented scoping results, introduced draft vision statement and management goals for the Monument.
- Planning Update 3: October 2003, described four initial draft alternatives.
- Planning Update 4: November 2004, presented proposed new management units, further refined the draft management alternatives and presented the FAC-generated alternative, solicited recipient responses indicating preference to receive a paper copy or CD of the draft CCP/EIS.
- Planning Update 5: October 2005, presented additional alternatives to be covered in the CCP, updates to those previously identified, and presented a revised time line for distribution of the draft CCP.

The Monument's web site at <http://hanfordreach.fws.gov> posts all news releases, planning updates, and related materials.

## 5.8 Review of Draft CCP

The FWS released the draft CCP/EIS on December 6, 2006, for public review and comment. The initial comment period was to close on February 23, 2007, eighty days later.<sup>174</sup> During that initial period, requests for extensions were received from the Yakama Nation and Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society. As a result, the FWS extended the comment period for an additional fifteen days to March 10, 2007.

During the ninety (or ninety-five) day comment period, the FWS received 308 timely comment letters.<sup>175</sup> These comment letters to the draft CCP/EIS were provided to the Portland, Oregon, offices of Jones & Stokes, an international environmental consulting firm, for review and cataloging. The

---

<sup>174</sup> Due to mailing transit times and the end-of-year holidays, the comment period was more realistically seventy-five days.

<sup>175</sup> The term 'letters' is defined as an written correspondence received during the comment period related to the draft CCP/EIS. Almost half the "letters" were actually in the form of email (105). Seventy-two comments were submitted through the Monument's web site. One comment was submitted via telephone and twenty-three through open house comment sheets. Only 107 letters were actually sent via United States Postal Service mail or through other carriers.

One problem related to the use of email, and especially the web, is that many pieces of correspondence were anonymous. As such, there is no way to verify the validity of the comment/commenter, or to clarify points made. Likewise, there is no way to distribute the final version of the plan back to those providing comments anonymously.

overwhelming majority of letters focused on four main themes—Boat Launches, Horseback Use, Hunting on Islands, and the Observatory on Rattlesnake Mountain—and comments were organized around these themes.<sup>176</sup> A fifth category, “Other,” was included to capture all other comments not fitting within these topics. Additional, minor themes are identified within each of the five main topics.

Very few direct comments were received on the factual content of the draft. Most comments were directed at hunters’ rights, access to public lands, wildlife management, etc., expressing the writer’s opinion of how the Monument should be managed. These comments were grouped together according to the categories discussed above. Where the opinion expressed provided some level of detail, or was based on a real or perceived fact, the FWS has provided a response. Where the comment represented solely an opinion and was not supported by any assertion, the FWS considered them in selection of the preferred alternative but did not respond to them here, other than to thank the writers for expressing their opinions and thoughts.

### ***5.8.1 Public Open Houses***

During the comment period, the FWS held four public open houses to answer questions from the public and to listen to concerns, comments and ideas. The open houses were an evening event on January 30, 2007, in the Mattawa Elementary School Gym; an evening event January 31, 2007, at the Sunnyside Community Center; an afternoon event February 5, 2007, at the Hampton Inn in Richland; and an evening event February 8, 2007, at the Red Lion Hotel in Pasco.<sup>177</sup> The open houses in Mattawa and Sunnyside were lightly attended, with eighteen and twelve people signing in, respectively. The Richland open house attendance was significantly higher, with forty-three sign-ins. The Pasco open house was fairly heavily attended, seventy-four attendees signing in, although how many of those people were there for the McNary and Umatilla National Wildlife Refuges CCP is unknown.

## **5.9 List of Preparers**

Many people assisted in the writing of this CCP. While the FWS hopes that the following lists are complete, there were so many people providing assistance, it is possible that some people’s name were inadvertently omitted. If so, please know that your contributions are valued and that the omission was in error.

---

<sup>176</sup> Due to the uniformity of comments and the volume of letters received, copies of the actual letters are not reprinted here.

<sup>177</sup> The February 8 open house was a joint event with the McNary and Umatilla National Wildlife Refuges, which also had a draft CCP out for public review and comment.

### ***5.9.1 Core Planning Team***

- Paula Call, Outdoor Recreation Planner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Ron Crouse, Information and Education Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Tom Ferns, Project Manager, Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington
- Jenna Gaston, Archeologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Mike Marxen, Planner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Planning, Sherwood, Oregon
- Woody Russell, NEPA Compliance Officer, Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington
- David Smith, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington

### ***5.9.2 Additional Preparers***

- Don Anglin, Fisheries Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Fisheries, Vancouver, Washington
- Jane Bardolf, Planner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Planning, Sherwood, Oregon
- Betsy Bloomfield, Biologist, The Nature Conservancy, Ellensburg, Washington
- Florence Caplow, Botanist, Washington Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, Washington
- James Evans, Biologist, The Nature Conservancy, Seattle, Washington
- Glen Frederick, Planner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Planning, Sherwood, Oregon

- Lindsey Hayes, Contaminants Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Jack Heisler, Refuge Operations Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Greg Hughes, Project Leader, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Heidi Newsome, Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Mike Ritter, Deputy Project Leader, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Sharon Selvaggio, Planner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Planning, Sherwood, Oregon

### **5.9.3 Contractors**

- Jennifer Barnes, Jones & Stokes, Bellevue, Washington (Economics and Transportation)
- Patrick Blair, Sunnyside, Washington (Wilderness)
- Brent Bouldin, Jones & Stokes, Portland, Oregon (Chapter 4 Writing/Editing)
- Kevin Butterbaugh, EDAW, Seattle, Washington (Aesthetics)
- Sergio Capozzi, EDAW, Seattle, Washington (Public Use)
- Richard Easterly, SEE Botanical, Tenino, Washington (Vegetation Inventory)
- Rosalie Ferri, Ellensburg, Washington (Wilderness, Cultural Resources)
- Larry Goral, Jones & Stokes, Sacramento, California (Writing/Editing)
- Mark Greenig, EDAW, Seattle, Washington (Aesthetics)
- Eric Gustafson, Richland, Washington
- Stacy McDowell, Jones & Stokes, Portland, Oregon (Public Comment Analysis)

- Catherine Rudiger, Jones & Stokes, Sacramento, California (Writing/Editing)
- Debra Salstrom, SEE Botanical, Tenino, Washington (Vegetation Inventory)
- Erin VanDehey, Jones & Stokes, Portland, Oregon (Chapters 2 and 4)
- Derek Van Marter, Triangle Associates, Seattle, Washington (Scoping, Federal Advisory Committee)

### ***5.9.4 Cooperating Agency and Consulting Government Staff***

- Kristie Baptiste, Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho
- Wyn Birkenthal, City of Richland Parks and Recreation Department, Richland, Washington
- Bill Erickson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle, Washington
- Tom Ferns, Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington
- Adam Fyall, Benton County Office of County Commissioners, Prosser, Washington
- Mary Hollen, Bonneville Power Administration, Richland, Washington
- Aimee Kinney, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle, Washington
- Paul LaRiviere, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Pasco, Washington
- Mike Livingston, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Pasco, Washington
- Jay McConnaughey, Yakama Nation, Union Gap, Washington
- Rudy Plager, Adams County Office of County Commissioners, Ritzville, Washington
- Donna Postma, Bureau of Reclamation, Ephrata, Washington
- David Rice, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle, Washington
- Don Rose, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oregon
- Ron Skinnerland, Washington Department of Ecology, Kennewick, Washington

- Hector Torres, Grant County Office of County Commissioners, Ephrata, Washington
- Althea Wolf, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Pendleton, Oregon
- Mark Ziminske, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle, Washington

### ***5.9.5 National Monument Federal Advisory Committee***

- Royace Aikin, Batelle, Richland, Washington (Alternate)
- Leo Bowman, Benton County Office of the Commissioners, Prosser, Washington
- Frank Brock, Franklin County Office of the Commissioners, Pasco, Washington (Alternate)
- Rex Buck, Wanapum, Ephrata, Washington (Alternate)
- Nancy Craig, Grant County Public Utilities District #5, Ephrata, Washington (Alternate)
- Dennis Dauble, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington (Alternate)
- David Geist, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington
- Eric Gerber, Richland, Washington (Alternate)
- Michele Gerber, Historian, Richland, Washington
- Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council, Kennewick, Washington (Alternate)
- Greg Hughes, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Richland, Washington (Designated Federal Officer)
- Rick Leaumont, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society, Richland, Washington
- Mike Lilga, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society, Richland, Washington (Alternate)
- Valoria Loveland, Richland, Washington (Alternate)
- Gene Schreckhise, Washington State University, Richland, Washington
- Alice Shorett, Triangle Associates, Seattle, Washington (Facilitator)

- Ron Skinnarland, Washington Department of Ecology, Richland, Washington (Alternate)
- Rich Steele, Columbia River Conservation League, Richland, Washington
- Jeff Tayer, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Yakima, Washington
- Bob Thompson, Mayor, Richland, Washington (Alternate)
- Kris Watkins, Pasco, Washington
- Jim Watts, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council, Kennewick, Washington (Chair)
- Karen Wieda, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington
- Mike Wiemers, Columbia River Conservation League, Richland, Washington (Alternate)

### ***5.9.6 GIS and Mapping***

- Jenny Barnett, GIS Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Liz Cruz, GIS Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon
- Lindsey Hayes, GIS Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hanford Reach National Monument, Richland, Washington
- Erin Stockenberg, GIS Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon

### ***5.9.7 Additional Assistance—Review, Consultation, Etc.***

- Scott Aikin, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, External Affairs, Portland, Oregon
- Kevin Clarke, Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington
- Paul Dunigan, Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington
- Nell Fuller, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Refuges, Portland, Oregon
- Ben Harrison, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Planning, Portland, Oregon

- Kevin Kilbride, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Refuges, Portland, Oregon
- Steve Moore, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Refuges, Portland, Oregon
- Fred Paveglio, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Refuges, Portland, Oregon
- Anan Raymond, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Cultural Resources, Portland, Oregon
- Annabelle Rodriguez, Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington
- Alex Teimouri, Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington
- Dana Ward, Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington

### ***5.9.8 Hanford Reach National Monument Management***

- Greg Hughes, Project Leader
- Lee Albright, Deputy Project Leader
- Mike Ritter, Deputy Project Leader

