

## CAHA-ORV EIS Conference Call Meeting Notes

6/26/09 – 7:30 AM MT

Attendees: Sandy Hamilton (EQD), Doug Wetmore (Berger), Lori Fox (Berger), Nancy VanDyke (Berger)

Chapter 1 Needs

- Need Paul Stevens to provide a summary of ORV management from 1985-2004. This was previously requested but never received.

*Action Item:* Sandy will check to see if we have this info already before passing the request on to the park

- Will soundscapes be carried forward?

Sandy said "possibly yes", but more information is needed from Frank Torino which could come as late as September, after the first internal draft. Berger is to assume that we will carry this topic forward until we hear something different. Sandy will send information from Frank T so that Berger can start writing this section up.

*Action Item:* Sandy to send Berger soundscape information, Berger to add soundscapes to the document.

- Air Quality dismissal needs to be revised based on NPS modeling effort

EQD is still waiting for the non-contact counts from RTI so that that data can be put into the model. Sandy said that Berger should assume that it will be dismissed unless we hear something different.

Chapter 3 Needs

- Need verification of beach mileages from Abra (p63-64)

*Action Item:* Sandy will contact Thayer and Abra to find out more about this.

- Need park comments on PIPL section for Chapters 3 and 4

*Action item:* Sandy will check with Mike and/or Thayer to see where this is and if they have an initial reaction to the level of analysis presented.

- Wintering data from SECN for REKN, AMOY, and WIPL

Doug had recently spoken with Mike Byrne at SECN, who indicated that he was too busy to assist with this request and suggested that we ask the park to access the database to get information. Mike had recommended that we NOT use raw bird count data, as it would not provide an accurate

estimate of wintering populations. Therefore, the normalized data would be the best. Doug said that we could cut and paste these graphics from the SECN report, but it would be poor quality.

*Action Item:* Sandy said that she would contact Thayer and Abra to see if they can access the database and provide Berger with the monthly bird counts so the normalized count graphic can be recreated in the EIS.

- Need CWB reports (w/appendices and nest counts from 2003, 2005, 2006 and 2007 from park) in order to verify and cite the data currently included in Chapter 3.

*Action Item:* Sandy said that she would contact Thayer or Abra to see if it's possible to get this data. Sandy indicated that the reports may not provide the necessary information.

### **New Stipulations in the Consent Decree**

Sandy thought that retracting the buffer expansion if a suspect was apprehended would not have much of an impact in the analysis of the resource topics. Any impacts of the new stipulations would probably be on visitor experience. For the narrative and tables in Chapter 2, the document should indicate the original measures in the Consent Decree and then provide the details and dates of the new stipulations. For the chapter 4, authors should do the analysis of the original Consent Decree and then indicate any changes in impact that would occur with the addition of the stipulations. The chapter should include a discussion on whether the stipulations would result in a change to the threshold or just the level of the threshold.

### **Alternatives**

Sandy said that she would work with Mike Murray to go through all of the public/agency comments and incorporate into the alternatives if necessary. Sandy indicated that the schedule for completing the alternatives is being finalized and that Mike is comfortable that elements are not missing from the current range of alternatives. Sandy said that she would also work with Thayer to address the discrepancies that Berger noted after reviewing the parks revised alternatives.

*Action Item:* Sandy to inform Berger when this conversation takes place and the alternatives can be considered final and ready to analyze.

### **USGS Peer Review**

Sandy indicated that there could possibly be a USGS peer review on the species management protocols used as the basis for the species management measures in the EIS. However, Berger was instructed to move forward with the alternatives as-is and not wait for the results of the USGS review. Berger is aware that there is the potential that this could result in changes to the species management tables and any analysis that is based on them, and would request a modification if there are any changes after impact analysis begins.

**Schedule**

Getting back on schedule could happen during the public comment review of the DEIS if more resources are directed at addressing comments. Berger indicated that they had several new staff members that should be available to help when the time comes. It would be helpful and efficient if we had an approved coding structure as soon as public comments were submitted. Sandy indicated that she would check with the NPS contracting officer about allocating funds more efficiently as more resources are needed during the comment review period.

The next call will be July 7<sup>th</sup> at 9:00am MT