

CAHA
EIS

955



Patrick Field
<pfield@cbuilding.org>
11/08/2005 09:30 AM

To <Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov>
cc Ona Ferguson <oferguson@cbuilding.org>, Robert Fisher
Robert Fisher <rcf@fisherco.com>
bcc
Subject Re: Report to whom?

SANDY

Let's try and connect by phone.

In terms of criteria, I think the choices come down to: 1) larger groups representing a broad constituency versus small groups representing a narrow but perhaps more directly affected constituency; 2) which state agencies given federal-state relations and state jurisdiction; 3) diverse and not easily combined interests in the "other user" category.

On the the question of the NOI, I don't see why you couldn't do that, but I'm not an expert on them, so . . . ? We are likely maybe to do something similar for 30 days now on our list (or partial list), and thus, you may have all the comment you need from the public if we attach in our final report all the comments received.

PAT

On 11/8/05 10:03am, "Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov" <Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov> wrote:

> Hi Pat,
>
> NPS is working on putting together a conference call among ourselves
> tomorrow to work on the EA and we can also discuss this at that time and
> get back to you in the afternoon on whether we'll do the choosing. Can you
> share with us which groups and people and what criteria you would suggest
> we use in making a choice (subject of course to approval up the line in
> DC)? Is it an option to publish both names in the NOI and solicit public
> comment on which should be the member and which the alternate?
>
> Sandy
>
> Sandy Hamilton
> National Park Service - Environmental Quality Division
> Academy Place
> P.O. Box 25287
> Denver CO 80225
> PH: (303) 969-2068
> FAX: (303) 987-6782
>
>
>
> Patrick Field
> <pfield@cbuilding To:
> "Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov" .org> <Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov>,
> "Mary_Doll@nps.gov"

> <Mary_Doll@nps.gov>
> 11/08/2005 08:00 cc: Ona Ferguson
> <oferguson@cbuilding.org>, Robert Fisher Robert Fisher
> AM EST
> <rcf@fisherccs.com> Subject: Report to whom?
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ALL
>
> We sent you all the report last night in draft final form. Our team is
> trying to decide whether to release this first just to the interviewees to
> review the revised terms and conditions, or, just to make it available more
> broadly. We'll get that sorted out in the next day to two days (Robert is
> on travel and on the west coast, so coordinating schedules) and let you
> know.
>
> In any case, we'll want to have the draft final report available via our
> website and a press release to the public at large sometime soon.
>
> One idea we want you all to consider and may need to talk about as
> mentioned
> in last night's email. With most stakeholder groups, we have worked out who
> would be members and alternates. In a few, however, we haven't been able
> to
> reach a consensus with the applicants for who would be a member and
> alternate. In those cases, one option is for us to decide among folks,
> though that puts us in a role that might harm our neutrality at least a
> bit.
> Another is to put forward the names we worked out and put forward in the
> categories where we didn't get consensus the larger number of applicants
> without deciding who gets the member versus alternate seats (the good news
> is that in no category are there more applicants than seats at least in
> terms of member and alternate seats). The down side of this is that leaves
> the final decision in the Park's hand and thus puts you all in the hot
> seat.
> Any thoughts on the two options above?
>
> PAT FIELD
>
>
>