

6.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

6.1 Public Participation Summary

Initial issues and indicators to be considered in the EIS are identified through public and agency scoping. This process, along with the results of scoping, was documented in a public scoping report (AECOM 2018).

6.1.1 Public Scoping Period and Meetings

The NOI for the SGP EIS was published in the Federal Register on June 5, 2017. Additionally, a legal notice was published in two local newspapers on June 1, 2017; *The Idaho Statesman* in Boise, Idaho; and *The McCall Star News* in McCall, Idaho.

In-person open house public meetings were held in Cascade, McCall, and Yellow Pine, and two meetings were held in Boise, Idaho.

The open house meetings provided a Project overview, maps of the Project area, and a forum for exchange of information and ideas or concerns related to the Project. Comment forms were available at the meetings. The Forest Service, Perpetua, cooperating agencies, and AECOM representatives were present. Lists of individuals who signed attendance sheets at the public meetings are included in the Scoping and Issues Summary Report (AECOM 2018).

The PNF received a total of 536 submissions during public scoping. The Scoping and Issues Summary Report can be viewed here: <https://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=50516>.

6.1.2 EIS Mailing List

The initial public mailing list for scoping was compiled and scoping letters were sent out to 519 interested individuals, agencies, and groups. The list included persons and agencies the Forest Service determined may have interest in the Project from past experience, the mailing list for the Project was then revised to add those persons who provided comments in response to scoping, requested to be on the mailing list, signed a scoping meeting list, or responded to the e-mail request for mailing addresses. Notifications of availability of the DEIS were sent to over 1,900 individuals.

6.1.3 Distribution of DEIS

A NOA for the DEIS was published in the Federal Register August 20, 2020. The NOA initiated a 60-day comment period; in response to requests for extension, a 15-day extension was granted for public comments on the DEIS. In total, approximately 10,000 submissions were received during the 75-day comment period in response to the DEIS. During that time, a virtual, on-line Project information room provided Project data for review such as posters, documents, and figures; due to the COVID-19 pandemic, in-person public meetings were not held. In addition, DEIS reference documents were available via a linked document on the Project webpage, except for information held as confidential per Forest Service procedures.

6.1.4 Distribution of Supplemental DEIS

After the public comment period for the SGP DEIS, Midas Gold (now Perpetua) revised the Plan to address potential impacts and public concerns. The comments received on the SGP DEIS were reviewed as additional scoping input during development of this SDEIS.

Upon publication of the NOA for this SDEIS in the Federal Register, a 45-day SDEIS review period was initiated.

The SDEIS was distributed as follows:

- An NOA was published in the Federal Register specifying dates for the comment period and the date, time, and location of the public comment meetings.
- A news release was provided by the Forest Service at the beginning of the 45-day comment period on the SDEIS. Legal notices and news releases were submitted to the same news organizations as for the initial public scoping announcement and DEIS announcement.
- The SDEIS was distributed to interested parties identified in the updated EIS mailing list, as previously described, and made available via the PNF website.

Public meetings will be held to obtain comments on the SDEIS and to answer questions that the public has regarding the SGP or the EIS process.

6.1.5 Final EIS Distribution

The FEIS distribution will be completed after consideration is given to comments received on the SDEIS. A 45-day FEIS availability period will be initiated by publication of the NOA for the FEIS in the Federal Register. The FEIS will be released as follows:

- The NOA will be published in the Federal Register.
- Copies of the FEIS will be sent to addresses on the updated mailing list and made available via the PNF website.

Legal notices and news releases will be issued to the same media sources used for previous Project announcements.

6.1.6 Record of Decision

The Forest Service will release a draft ROD and begin an objection period concurrent with the 45-day availability for the FEIS. The Forest Service will not issue a draft ROD but will issue a final ROD after considering the FEIS and public comments received during the availability period. The Forest Service's Final ROD will be distributed to those identified in the updated EIS mailing list. The Forest Service will post its Final ROD on the PNF Current and Recent Projects website which publishes the Schedule of Proposed Actions.

6.2 Consultation with Agencies and Tribal Governments

6.2.1 Cooperating Agencies

The Forest Service is the lead federal agency for this EIS. Two federal agencies, three state agencies, and Valley County are serving as cooperating agencies for this EIS and are listed below. These cooperating agencies are informing the EIS process and providing early input into certain issues addressed in the EIS, based on specific areas of jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise, and participating in development of an EIS that provides a full and fair disclosure of the probable impacts of the SGP, and that provides a sound basis for agency permit decisions. The following cooperating agencies participated in and informed the alternatives development and evaluation process to determine which alternatives would be carried forward for further analysis in the SDEIS.

- United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Idaho Governor's Office of Energy and Mineral Resources (OEMR)
- Idaho Department of Lands (IDL)
- Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ)
- Valley County

Coordination with federal and state agencies was ongoing throughout the preparation of the SDEIS with regularly scheduled calls and issue-specific meetings.

6.2.2 Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation

The Forest Service is collaborating with USFWS, NOAA/NMFS to comply with consultation procedures intended to satisfy their requirements under the ESA and NEPA.

Consultation, for purposes of both ESA and NEPA compliance, should be sensitive to the concerns and needs of the consulting and cooperating agencies. The Forest Service collaborative process included utilizing regularly scheduled monthly meetings, primarily for informal consultation discussions on fish species. Informal consultation is important for a project with potential impacts to federally listed species as it provides an opportunity for the lead federal agency (i.e., Forest Service) to communicate and collaborate with the applicant, USFWS, NOAA/NMFS, and other state and local agencies, to gather important information while developing the Project's biological assessment (BA). Once the final BA is submitted to the USFWS and NOAA/NMFS, and the two federal agencies accept the BA as complete, informal consultation would end and the SGP would proceed with formal consultation due to potential effects to the federally listed species.

6.2.2.1 Endangered Species Act

The ESA (16 USC Ch. 35 Section 1531 et seq. 1988) is federal legislation that is intended to provide a means to conserve the ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species depend and provide programs for the conservation of those species, thus preventing extinction of plants and animals. Aspects of the law pertaining to plants are administered by USFWS. The USFWS and NOAA/NMFS designate threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate plant and wildlife species and their critical habitats under the ESA. Candidate species have no protection under the ESA, but they are often included in the

NEPA process for early planning consideration. Section 7 of the ESA generally requires federal agencies, in consultation with the USFWS and NOAA/NMFS, to ensure that any actions they fund, authorize, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued survival of any ESA-listed threatened or endangered plant or wildlife species, or to adversely modify their designated critical habitat.

6.2.2.2 Informal Consultation History

Informal consultation on the Project began in 2017 and is ongoing. The pertinent letters, emails, meetings, and conference calls are summarized in a collaboration memo in the Administrative Record. Formal consultation will commence once the final BA is deemed complete and accepted by USFWS and NOAA/NMFS.

6.2.2.3 Species Considered and Evaluated

The following species have been included in informal consultation discussions based on suitable habitat and known occurrences in and around the Project.

- Canada Lynx (Federally Threatened)
- Northern Idaho Ground Squirrel (Federally Threatened)
- Wolverine (Proposed Threatened)
- Killer whale (Federally Endangered)
- Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook Salmon (Federally Threatened with Designated Critical Habitat)
- Snake River Basin Steelhead (Federally Threatened with Designated Critical Habitat)
- Columbia River Bull Trout (Federally Threatened with Designated Critical Habitat)
- Monarch butterfly (Federal Candidate)
- Whitebark Pine (Proposed Threatened)

6.2.3 Tribal Consultation and Government-to-Government Consultation

The Forest Service collaborated with Tribal partners to comply with consultation procedures intended to satisfy their requirements under NEPA and also the NHPA to ensure consideration for tribal resources and concerns in the context of these requirements.

Inherent in the tribal consultation process is also consideration for guidance set forth in EO 13175 *Tribal Consultation and Coordination* and EO 13007 *Consultation with Tribes on Indian Sacred Sites*. EO 13175 mandates that executive departments and agencies engage in regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials in the development of Federal policies that have tribal implications and are responsible for strengthening the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes. EO 13007 requires Federal agencies, to the extent practicable, to accommodate access to and use of sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners, and to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sacred sites. Both EO 13175 and 13007 should be considered in the context of the NEPA and Section 106 consultation process.

Consultation, for purposes of both NEPA and NHPA compliance, and including the mandates set forth in EO 13175 and EO 13007, should be conducted in a manner recognizing the unique government-to-

government relationship that exists between the federal government and tribes, should be respectful of tribal sovereignty, and should be sensitive to the concerns and needs of the Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization. The Forest Service collaborative process has included utilizing regularly scheduled periodic meetings to engage Indian tribes who may be interested or affected by the SGP, including the Nez Perce Tribe, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, and the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes. The following sections describe the government-to-government consultation process and the framework within which the PNF implemented a collaborative process for tribal consultation in compliance with NEPA and the NHPA. Included in this collaborative approach is a process by which consulting parties, including Tribal partners, participate in the development of a PA designed to resolve adverse effects to historic properties under the NHPA Section 106 review process (**Section 6.2.4**).

6.2.3.1 Government-to-Government Consultation

The government-to-government relationship between federal agencies and federally-recognized tribes is a special relationship based on Tribal Sovereignty. The Forest Service is conducting government-to-government consultation regarding the SGP with the following federally-recognized tribes: the Nez Perce Tribe; Shoshone-Bannock Tribes; and the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes. This consultation process was initiated with the tribes through a notification letter from the Forest Service offering opportunities to participate in formal government-to-government consultation, to participate in the NEPA process as a cooperating agency, and/or to routinely receive information about the SGP.

Tribal governments have a special and unique legal and political relationship with the U.S. government as reflected in the U.S. Constitution, treaties, statutes, court decisions, executive orders, and memoranda. This relationship imparts a duty on all federal agencies to consult, coordinate, and communicate with American Indian tribes on a government-to-government basis.

The intergovernmental consultation process serves as the primary means for the federal agencies to carry out their trust responsibilities/obligations. Consultation is not a single event, but instead is an informed process leading to a decision. Consultation means different things to different tribes. It can be either a formal process of negotiation, cooperation, and policy-level decision-making between tribal governments and the federal government, or a more informal process. Tribal rights, ideas, and interests are discussed and considered or incorporated into the decision. Tribal consultation is an on-going relationship between agencies and tribes, characterized by consensus-seeking approaches to reach mutual understanding and resolve issues. It may concern issues and actions that could affect the government's decision-making processes, or other tribal interests.

Consultation minimally serves five purposes:

- To identify and clarify issues;
- To provide for an exchange of existing information and identify where information is needed;
- To identify and serve as a process for conflict resolution;
- To provide an opportunity to discuss and explain the decision; and
- To fulfill the core of the federal trust obligation.

Because Native American tribes can be affected by the policies and actions of the Forest Service in managing the lands and resources under its jurisdiction, the Forest Service has a duty to consult with them on matters affecting their interests. Because of this government-to-government relationship, efforts were made to involve local tribal governments and to solicit their input regarding the SGP.

The Forest Service first notified Nez Perce Tribe cultural resource staff about the SGP on March 1, 2017. Formal consultation with the Nez Perce Tribe was requested and initiated on May 23, 2017. The Nez Perce Tribe formalized opposition to the SGP in a resolution passed by the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee (the governing body of the tribe) on October 9, 2018 and announced opposition in a press release the same day. Despite formal opposition to the SGP, the tribe continues to participate in a previously established Project-specific informal consultation process, including discussion on ways to avoid, reduce, or mitigate impacts.

The Forest Service introduced the SGP to Shoshone-Paiute Tribal leadership during the Wings and Roots Program meeting (government-to-government consultation) on April 13, 2017.

The SGP was formally presented to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fort Hall Business Council and also informally to tribal staff on July 26, 2017.

Updates to each of these tribes are provided in an ongoing basis during Project-specific ad-hoc consultation meetings, and the Forest Service will continue to engage in government-to-government consultation throughout the NEPA process.

The structure of formal government-to-government consultation is between tribal governing bodies (Executive Committee, Tribal Councils, Tribal Chairperson, traditional Chiefs, or those identified formally by a tribe's governing body as 'representative' of that tribe's interests) and Forest Service Line Officers. Staff-to-staff meetings usually include Forest Service technical specialists and tribal liaison and technical specialists.

The Shoshone-Paiute Tribes do not conduct informal consultation; however, they have professionally moderated meetings between the Tribal Business Council Chair and the Forest Service Line Officers, with other members of the Council and/or tribal staff occasionally attending as well.

USACE has been represented in one or more Project-specific Forest Service consultation meetings with each of these tribes, in an informal capacity, to offer information on the CWA Section 404 permitting process.

The Nez Perce Tribe, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes, and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes were invited on April 30, 2020, to participate in development of a project-specific PA and associated historic properties treatment plan and historic properties management plan, which are being prepared to mitigate impacts and address Section 106 of the NHPA compliance.

6.2.4 NHPA Section 106 Process

6.2.4.1 NEPA and NHPA Policy Guidance and Process

Under the NEPA process, agencies evaluate the environmental and related social and economic effects of their federal action (40 CFR 1508.1(q)). Requirements in Sections 1501.2 and 1501.7 of the CEQ regulations call for the involvement of Tribes that may be affected by a federal proposal.

Review under the NHPA, often referred to as Section 106 review, is focused only on historic properties; defined in the NHPA (54 U.S.C. § 300308) as any “prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion on, the National Register of Historic Places, including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property or resource.”

Although NEPA and the NHPA are two separate laws which require federal agencies to take into consideration the effects that a proposed project may have on historic properties, integration of the review process allows for efficiencies, promotes accountability and transparency in the consultation process, and encourages a broader discussion of potential effects to the human environment including historic properties. Since Section 106 review must be completed prior to the completion of NEPA review, an integrated approach could include the combination of public involvement efforts, efforts to identify and assess potential effects to historic properties, and in the final stages of the process a path to resolve adverse effects. This approach not only meets the requirements and intent of Section 106 review, but it also informs the NEPA review process required to reach a ROD for a project. For projects where NHPA and NEPA compliance is required, the ACHP can be offered the opportunity to participate in the process and may offer guidance on the integration of reviews where they address potential effects to historic properties.

Under the NHPA process, agencies evaluate if there might be an effect to historic properties from a federal undertaking (36 CFR 800.16(y)). If an effect is identified, the agency proceeds with Section 106 review which involves identifying and assessing what historic properties could be affected by the project. The Section 106 process is by nature intended to be collaborative, and consulting parties should be included in and participate in the process. Consulting parties may include the State (or Tribal) Historic Preservation Officer, local government, interested federally recognized Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations, and other interested parties. Historic preservation organizations and others with an interest in the preservation outcomes of the project or those with a legal or economic interest may also be invited to join Section 106 consultation.

The NHPA outlines when federal agencies must offer consultation with Tribes and the issues and other factors this consultation must address. Tribal consultation is required, if there is a potential affect to a tribe(s), in all steps of the Section 106 process when a federal agency undertaking may affect historic properties that are either (1) located on tribal lands, or (2) when any Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization attaches traditional use and/or religious or cultural significance to the historic property, regardless of the property’s location. This consultation should take place through the formal government-to-government consultation process as described in the previous section. To reiterate, the intergovernmental consultation process serves as the primary means for the federal agencies to carry out their Section 106 responsibilities/obligations under Section 106 of the NHPA and NEPA. Because Native American tribes can be affected by the policies and actions of the Forest Service in managing the lands

and resources under its jurisdiction, the Forest Service has a duty to consult with them on matters affecting their interests.

NHPA, Section 101(d)(6)(A) establishes that historic properties of “traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization may be determined to be eligible for inclusion” in the NRHP. Federal agencies are specifically instructed to consult with relevant Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations when an undertaking may affect properties of traditional religious and cultural importance. These properties may be located on ancestral, aboriginal, or ceded lands of Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations. The consultation requirement for properties of traditional religious and cultural importance applies regardless of the location of both the historic property and the Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization.

General principles for federal agencies in Section 106 tribal consultation include:

- Federal agencies shall ensure that tribal consultation in the Section 106 process provides the Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization with a reasonable opportunity to identify its concerns about historic properties, advise on the identification and evaluation of historic properties, articulate its views on the undertaking’s effects on such properties, and participate in the resolution of adverse effects.
- It is the responsibility of the federal agency to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations that shall be consulted in the Section 106 process.

6.2.4.2 Development of the NHPA Programmatic Agreement

Through the Section 106 and NEPA review process, the Forest Service determined that the authorization of the SGP would result in adverse effects to historic properties and that the resolution of these adverse effects could be completed through the negotiation and eventual implementation of a project-specific PA.

Because of the SGP’s size, scope, and various alternatives under consideration, the Forest Service as the lead federal agency, initiated preparation of the PA as a management tool to address project effects on cultural resources and to minimize or resolve any potential adverse effects.

A PA outlines measures for compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, including but not limited to: protocols for the identification and evaluation of historic properties; permitting requirements; treatment of historic properties; monitoring requirements; inadvertent discovery protocols; curation; and treatment of human remains. The SGP PA would identify known adverse effects to historic properties and provide a discussion of proposed mitigation measures that would be implemented. The SGP PA would also include a historic properties treatment plan and historic properties management plan to further refine the requirements for resolution of adverse effects and complete the Section 106 process. A PA is a legal document with signatories and concurring parties. The PA will be fully executed prior to completion of the ROD.

The Forest Service is collaborating with Consulting Parties in the development of the PA in order to comply with consultation procedures intended to satisfy their requirements under the NHPA and the

NEPA. On April 30, 2020, the Forest Service initiated the consultation process for the development of the PA by extending invitations to participate in the process pursuant to the regulations of Section 106 of the NHPA to interested parties. Letters were sent to the Nez Perce Tribe, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes, and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes with a request for response within 30 days. Additionally, invitations were extended to the USACE, IPCo., Perpetua, the SHPO, and the ACHP.

The Forest Service collaborative process includes utilizing regularly scheduled periodic meetings to engage the identified Consulting Parties to the PA who are listed in **Table 6.2-1**.

Table 6.2-1 Programmatic Agreement Consulting Parties

Organization	Role in Project and PA
United States Department of Agriculture, United States Forest Service, Payette National Forest (Forest Service)	Lead Federal Agency, Signatory
Idaho State Historic Preservation Office (ID SHPO)	Section 106 Compliance, Signatory
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)	Signatory
Idaho Power Company (IPCo)	Invited Signatory
Perpetua Resources Idaho Inc. (PRII)	Project Proponent; Invited Signatory
Nez Perce Tribe	Consulting Party
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Consulting Party
Shoshone-Paiute Tribes	Consulting Party
United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Consulting Party
Mary Anne Davis	Consulting Party

6.3 Ongoing Coordination Efforts

Coordination with cooperating and other permitting agencies will continue to occur following the release of the SDEIS. Agency expertise will remain important for informing the analysis and addressing comments from the public to develop the Final EIS. Consultation with the USFWS and NOAA/NMFS will continue for ESA and EFH assessments.

The Forest Service remains available for government-to-government consultation with federally recognized tribes. Government-to-government consultation is an ongoing effort by the Forest Service to share information, answer questions, listen to concerns, and resolve issues.

Consultation and coordination with consulting parties to resolve adverse effects to historic properties in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA will continue. A PA will be developed through discussions with the consulting parties to ensure that the requirements of Section 106 are satisfied. The Forest Service intends to complete the PA in the same timeframe as the FEIS and ROD.

A NOA of this SDEIS was published in the Federal Register informing stakeholders and other members of the public that the SDEIS is available for comment for 60 days. It is the intent of the Forest Service to

host a virtual public open house during the SDEIS comment period due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Please refer to the “dear reader” letter at the beginning of this document for more information.

The Project website will continue to be updated throughout the EIS process, and the Schedule of Proposed Actions will be updated quarterly throughout the process.

6.4 List of Preparers and Reviewers

The SGP EIS was prepared under the supervision of the Forest Service. The individuals who contributed to the preparation of this document are listed here by organization, along with their Project role, education, and years of experience as appropriate (Tables 6.4-1 through 6.4-4).

The following Forest Service personnel were involved in review of the SDEIS and/or related Project documentation (Table 6.4-1).

Table 6.4-1 Forest Service

Forest Service Reviewer	Title
Linda Jackson (PNF)	Forest Supervisor
Kevin Knesek (PNF)	Deputy Forest Supervisor
David Hogen (PNF)	Krassel District Ranger
Jake Strohmeier (BNF)	Cascade District Ranger
Paul Klasner (PNF)	Natural Resources Staff Officer
Sarah Lau (PNF)	Recreation, Engineering, Archaeology, Lands and Minerals Staff Officer
Ronda Bishop (PNF)	Administration and Planning Staff Officer
Brian Harris (PNF)	Forest Public Affairs Officer and Tribal Liaison
Sitka Pence (WO)	Project Manager
Kellie Brown, ret. (PNF)	Administrative Assistant
Josh Sampson (PNF)	Forest Recreation Program Manager
Morgan Zedalis (PNF) Susie Osgood (BNF)	Forest Archaeologist
Susan Miller (PNF)	Forest Ecologist
Pleasant McNeel (R4) Brinda Ramanathan (R4)	Air Quality Program Manager
June Galloway (PNF) Lisa Nutt (BNF)	Forest Wildlife Biologist
Todd Leeds (PNF)	Forest Hydrologist/ R4 CERCLA On-Scene Coordinator
Kristin Williams (PNF)	Forest Botanist
Megan Heider (PNF)	Timber Program Manager
Jason Wright (PNF)	Forest Transportation Planner
Clayton Nalder (PNF)	Forest Fisheries Biologist
John Dixon (PNF)	Soil Scientist
William Perry (PNF)	Civil Engineer

Forest Service Reviewer	Title
Natalie Little (R4)	Regional Sustainable Operations & Climate Change Coordinator
Kathy Zamba (R4)	Environmental Engineer
Heidie Torrealday (R4)	Regional Geologist
Edward Gazzetti (WO)	Minerals and Geology Management - Hydrogeologist
Chris Miller (WO)	Economist
Bret Anderson (WO)	Physical Scientist
Jacob Deal (WO)	GHG ORISE Fellow
Catherine Doyle-Capitman (WO)	National-Level Social Scientist
Jennifer Purvine (WO)	Planning Biologist/IDT Leader
Christine Bradbury (RO)	R1/R4 Tribal Liaison
Daniel Morris (RO)	Wilderness and Wild and Scenic River Program Manager
Amy Marshall (R4)	Idaho Roadless Coordinator
Iliia Fiene (R4)	Landscape Architect

BNF = Boise National Forest; ORISE = Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education; PNF = Payette National Forest; RO = Regional Office; R1 = Northern Regional Office; R4 = Intermountain Regional Office; ret = retired; WO = Washington DC Office

Table 6.4-2 Cooperating Agencies

Agency	Point of Contact
United States Army Corp of Engineers Walla Walla District Boise Regulatory Office 720 Park Boulevard, Suite 245 Boise, Idaho 83712	Christen Marve Griffith, Regulatory Project Manager
United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10 Policy and Environmental Review Branch U.S. EPA Region 10, Alaska Operations Office 1200 6 th Avenue, Suite 155, MS 14-D12 Seattle, WA 98101-3144	Susan Sturges, NEPA Reviewer
Idaho Department of Environmental Quality 1445 North Orchard Street Boise, Idaho 83706	Aaron Scheff, Boise Regional Office Administrator
Idaho Department of Lands Payette Lakes Area Office 555 Deinhard Lane McCall, Idaho 83638	Diane Green, Regulatory/Reclamation
Governor's Office of Energy and Mineral Resources 304 North 8th Street, Suite 250 Boise, Idaho 83702	George Lynch, Minerals Policy Analyst

Agency	Point of Contact
Valley County Valley County Commission P.O. Box 1350 Cascade, Idaho 83611	Elt Hasbrouck, Commissioner

Table 6.4-3 Third Party EIS Preparers – Stantec Consulting Services Inc.

Contributor	Project Role	Qualifications	Years of Experience
Brian Buck	Principal-In-Charge, NEPA Process, geology, hazardous materials	B.S., Geology M.S., Geological Engineering	46
George Fennemore	Project Manager, Proposed Action and Alternatives, Water Resources, Public Health & Safety, Environmental Justice	B.S., Mathematics M.S., Applied Mathematics Ph.D., Applied Mathematics	26
Greg Brown	Assistant Project Manager, Scenic Resources	B.S., Natural Resource Management (Wildlife Emphasis)	30
Jenni Prince Mahoney	Lead Author, Heritage Resources, Tribal Rights and Interests, Recreation	B.A., Anthropology Graduate Certificate, NEPA	30
Ben Veach	Project Administrator, Noise, Transportation, Land Use & Management	B.S., Forestry	36
Stephanie Theis	Fisheries	B.S., Fisheries Ecology Graduate Education in Applied Ecology and Conservation Biology - Fish	32
Matt Brekke	Botanical Resources, Wildlife	B.S., Wildlife Biology; Minor: Fishery Biology	16
Melany Gagliardi	Administrative Record, Public Involvement	A.A., Accounting	10
Cory Bolen	GIS Team Lead	B.S., Forest Resources – Ecosystem Management M.S., Forest Sciences w/emphasis in Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Ecology and Spatial Statistical Modeling	20
Dave Kikkert	Wetlands	B.S, Fisheries and Wildlife M.S., Ecology	20
Eric Clark	Air Quality, Climate Change	B.S., Environmental Science M.S., Civil Engineering	16
Haley Barnes	Administration	B.S., Range Management	6
Ellen Brady	Heritage Resources, Programmatic Agreement	B.S., Anthropology M.A., Anthropology	25
Sierra Marke	Soils, Special Designations, Recreation, Noise	B.A., Geology - Environmental Science	2

Contributor	Project Role	Qualifications	Years of Experience
Jen Sojka	Social and Economic Resources	B.A., Biology M.S., Biological Sciences	6
Shelby Hockaday	Scenic Resources, Transportation	B.S., Earth Sciences: Geography M.S., Geography	5
Jessica Jarvis	GIS	B.A., Environmental Studies	8
Chris Johnson	GIS	B.S., Geology	38
Jason Trook	GIS	B.A., Anthropology M.S., Geography	19

Table 6.4-4 Third Party EIS Preparers - Subcontractors

Contributor	Project Role	Qualifications	Years of Experience
Derek Risso Ecosystem Sciences	Fish Resources and Fish Habitat, Stream Restoration, Fisheries, Water Rights and Resources	B.A. Environmental Studies M.S. Fisheries and Wildlife Science	24
Zach Herzfeld Ecosystem Sciences	Fish Resources and Fish Habitat	B.A. International Business/Spanish M.S. Geography	12
Tim Maguire Ecosystem Sciences	Fish Resources and Fish Habitat	B.A. Environmental Studies M.S. Geography	25
Kristi Schaff Nexus Environmental Consultants	NEPA documentation	B.S., Land Rehabilitation with a minor in Soils	18

6.5 Mailing List

6.5.1 Federal Agencies

- Acquisition and Serials Branch
- Forest Service, Boise National Forest
- Forest Service, Cascade Ranger District
- Forest Service, Intermountain Regional Office
- Forest Service, Payette National Forest
- Forest Service, Salmon-Challis National Forest
- National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service
- Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
- United States Army Corps of Engineers
- United States Bureau of Reclamation
- United States Department of Justice
- United States Environmental Protection Agency
- United States Fish and Wildlife Services

6.5.2 State Agencies

- Idaho Congressional Representatives
- Idaho Department of Commerce
- Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game
- Idaho Department of Labor
- Idaho Department of Lands
- Idaho Department of Water Resources
- Idaho Governor's Office of Energy and Mineral Resources (OEMR)
- Idaho House of Representatives
- Idaho State Historic Preservation Office
- Idaho State Historical Society
- Idaho State Senate
- Office of Governor Brad Little

6.5.3 Tribes

- Nez Perce Tribe
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
- Shoshone-Paiute Tribes

6.5.4 Local Government

- Ada County Commissioners
- Adams County Commissioners
- Boise County Commissioners
- Cascade Chamber of Commerce
- Cascade School District #422
- City of Cascade
- City of Donnelly
- City of McCall
- Valley County Board of County Commissioners

6.5.5 Organizations and Businesses

- 8th Street Marketplace
- Academy Mortgage
- Advocates for the West
- Alliance for the Wild Rockies
- American Exploration & Mining Association
- Ameriben
- Amerigas Propane
- Backcountry Recreation Club
- Blue Ribbon Coalition

- Bob Bate Ford
- Boise Valley Fly Fisherman
- Cascade Medical Center
- Center for Biological Diversity
- Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
- Deadwood Outfitters
- Donnelly Rural Fire Protection District
- Elk Springs Outfitters
- Fly Fishers of Idaho
- Formation Capital Team
- Golden Eagle Audubon
- Golden Predator
- Granite Excavation, Inc.
- Greater Garden Valley Areas Chamber of Commerce
- Hecla Mining Company
- Idaho Association of Commerce & Industry
- Idaho ATV Association
- Idaho Chapter, United Women Entrepreneurs
- Idaho Conservation League
- Idaho First Bank
- Idaho Junior Steelheads
- Idaho Mining Association
- Idaho Outfitters and Guides
- Idaho Power Company
- Idaho Recreation Council
- Idaho Rivers United
- Idaho State Bowhunters
- Idaho Whitewater Association
- Idaho Wildlife Federation
- IDAK Consulting Inc.
- Intermountain Forest Association
- Ivy Minerals, Inc.
- Jerry's Auto Parts
- JJO LLC
- J.R. Simplot Company
- Juniper Mountain Outfitters
- Kniefel Insurance
- Leavitt & Associates Engineers Inc.
- May Security
- McCall Area Snowmobile Club
- Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.
- Mile High Power Sports

- Mining Minnesota
- Mink Geohydro Inc.
- Monsanto
- Norell Ranch
- Northwest Whitewater
- Outsider Club
- Pistol Creek Outfitters
- Press in the Pines
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
- Rocky Mountain Signs
- ROSE Advocates
- Sierra Club – Idaho Chapter
- Sulphur Creek Ranch Outfitters
- Teck America Incorporated
- The Cascade Store Employees and Owners
- The Lilypad, LLC
- The McCall Candy Company LLC
- The McCall Store LLC
- The Nature Conservancy
- The Wilderness Society
- Treasure Valley Backcountry Horsemen
- Treasure Valley Trail Machine Association
- Trout Unlimited
- Valley Soil & Water Conservation District
- Wapiti Meadows Ranch
- Warm Lake Users Association
- West Mountain Snowmobile Club
- Western Lands Project
- Western State Equipment Company
- Winter Wildlands Alliance
- Women’s Mining Coalition
- Yellow Pine Fire Protection District
- Yellow Pine General Store
- Zena Creek Ranch

6.5.6 Individuals

Notifications of the availability of the SDEIS also were sent to over 1,900 individuals via email and hardcopy letter.