

1519
CAHA

CAHA Conf Call.
2/13/07

Mike Murray
Cyndi Holda
Thayer Broili
Sandi Hamilton
Doug Stover
Jeff Gutierrez

Documents open for public comments: Notice of Intent to prepare and EIS
No one knows they can comment on it
They will fix that on PEPC

Public request: people are putting comments here
Shouldn't be happening – only if they are requesting a document

PEPC Committee: making language clearer for the public
Public not getting what they are supposed to do
Put a disclaimer in that box saying that if they put comments in that box, they will not be entered
66 comments – only 4 related to ORVs
Others related to other docs

Chart that has proposed participants: ready to send that this afternoon
Privacy issues have been addressed.

Hard copy mailing addresses:
She (?) needs regular snail mail addresses for people.

Regular revision of document with editorial
In red to be able to see it

Substantive Items for Discussion (see list):

1st one: Thresholds:

No requirement to prepare an ISR, but they usually do
Its nice to share with the public to get more comments for public scoping
We should finish as much as we can so people can see it

Thayer: should we try to complete this and not have the no action alt in it?

Not a positive response from Sarah B. about this idea
Sarah thinks its better to just wait.

-Better to have public scoping meeting before starting to take comments
Public starts to toss around all new ideas that aren't being considered

Delay until we have the interim strategy section finished

1pm Wednesday Conference Call on Performance measures

2nd) Is this really an issue? Do we need to look at it?

Low impact fishing (not referring to commercial fishing)

No discussion of people being dependant on that fish/source of protein...

3rd) Do we want to include the present and previous, just the current, or none?

None.

(agreement)

Lori: document who was there on the IDT (talk to Sandi H about this)

4th) Not a mandatory CEQ topic, or DO12

It is in the Environmental screening form, so we must discuss it

Threshold answer: can't ignore/eliminate it

Do we need to keep gateway communities as a topic?

Do we have any gateway communities?

They apply to all of them (the definitions (on handout) apply to all the communities we are looking at)

Is it more the county? Wouldn't these decisions be made at the county level?

We can consider them all to be gateway communities.

County elected officials make the decisions on zoning and things like that.

Is it going to be important to have another impact topic? Or do we say that the discussion for gateway communities is in the socioeconomic section

Traditionally associated people

All are gateway communities, including Nags Head

5) Floodplains.

Wetlands are an impact topic, but are floodplains?

The entire park is in the 100 year flood plan.

I would leave it in: Sandi

What is the definition of floodplain?

It includes coastal

7) MOU is old and outdated

Need to rewrite that section.

6) Reading this from the outside, it's hard to see what the alternative frameworks are trying to accomplish.

Need to create better language – saying it's just a starting point for discussion

Terminology that needs to be defined

Lori, can you look at this?

Any other topics needed to talk about?

1) Neutralize "park staff" and say "NPS".

2) Restructure the alternative concepts

3) Follow up with Jami and/or Rich for

4) Performance measures