

0024445

CAHA# 2852



"Fox, Lori"  
<lfox@louisberger.com>  
10/15/2009 07:18 PM

To <Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov>  
cc "Wetmore, Doug" <dwetmore@louisberger.com>, "Van Dyke, Nancy" <nvandyke@louisberger.com>  
bcc  
Subject PIPL Summary

Hi Sandy,

In preparation for tomorrow's call with the park, I went through the PIPL impacts section and pulled out all of the statements that had to do with impacts. Doing this for A – C confirmed one of the thoughts I was having after talking to you today and that is, our impact summary's do not accurately capture our impact analysis. The conclusion statements are so general that when put side by side in a matrix, you don't see any difference. Pulling each statement out, you can see some differences. I am sure that Mike has some other greater concerns about the level of impacts (for example, surveying is always a long-term minor to moderate benefit) which we can discuss tomorrow, but I do think we can also benefit from more detailed conclusion statements that better show differences.

That is it for tonight, just wanted to share my thoughts before tomorrow (and before I forgot!)

Take care,  
Lori

**Lori Fox**  
Deputy Director, Denver Operations/Senior Planner

**Direct 303-985-6602**  
**Main 303-985-6600**  
**Mobile 301-461-8772**

**Fax 303-984-4942**

**The Louis Berger Group, Inc.** | 12596 West Bayaud Street| Suite 201 | Lakewood, CO 80228-2031 | [www.louisberger.com](http://www.louisberger.com)

This message, including any attachments hereto, may contain privileged and/or confidential information and is intended solely for the attention and use of the intended addressee(s). If you are not the intended addressee, you may neither use, copy, nor deliver to anyone this message or any of its attachments. In such case, you should immediately destroy this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply mail. Unless made by a person with actual authority conferred by The Louis Berger Group, Inc., (Berger) the information and statements herein do not constitute a binding commitment or warranty by Berger. Berger assumes no responsibility for any misperceptions, errors or misunderstandings. You are urged to verify any information that is confusing and report any errors/concerns to us in writing.



PIPL summary.docx

PIPL

**Alternative A**

Species Surveying and Management

- Beneficial impacts from surveying and pre-nesting closures
- Surveying may result in long-term minor to moderate beneficial impacts
- Adverse impacts is variable buffers are not adjusted in a timely manner
- Generally, buffers have long-term minor to moderate beneficial effects
- Minor to moderate benefits from resource closures that adjust to chick behavior (discuss, does CAHA see this as a benefit?)
- Public outreach would have long-term minor beneficial impacts (right now same under all alts)
- Most surveying and management actions under A would have long-term minor to moderate beneficial impacts by providing data for more effective management

Recreation Activities

- Provision of alternate routes and bypasses could have short-term negligible to minor impacts depending on distance to PIPL
- Increased change of non-compliance with buffers and closures = long-term moderate to major adverse impacts (b/c of greater access to all areas of the Seashore)
- Recreation and commercial fishing at night = long-term moderate adverse impacts
- ORV use above wrack line and below dune line = beneficial
- ORVs increase presence of predators = long-term moderate to major source of predation

**Alternative B**

Species Surveying and Management

- Increased monitoring = minor to moderate beneficial impacts (same as A)
- Increase observations is closure is enlarged = beneficial
- Buffers = long-term minor to moderate beneficial due to providing safe distance from the resource
- Surveying plan = minor to moderate benefits
- Year-round closures of suitable interior habitats = minor benefits
- Public outreach = long-term minor benefits (same as A)
- Most surveying and management actions under A would have long-term minor to moderate beneficial impacts by providing data for more effective management (Same as A)

Recreation Activities

- ORV bypass route = adverse impact
- Monitoring and increasing buffers when there is disturbance = reduce impacts to PIPL
- Lack of compliance with buffers = long-term moderate to major adverse (discuss: how should non-compliance be addressed across the alternatives)
- No night driving – improved over A, but still long-term moderate adverse impacts (not consistent with alternative C, discuss with Richard – change to a benefit to be consistent with C?)

### **Alternative C – Seasonal Management**

#### **Species Surveying and Management**

- Surveying = long-term minor to moderate beneficial impacts (Same as A, discuss with Britta, does the Park see a difference on the ground between A, B, and what could happen under action alternatives?)
- Size of resource closures = minor to moderate benefits, also adjust to chick mobility
- Outside SM areas, long-term minor adverse as buffers may not be as effective in those areas
- Observations under SM1 = negligible impact
- Non-breeding management protocols = long-term, minor to moderate beneficial impacts
- Public outreach = long-term minor benefits

#### **Recreation and Other Activities**

- Management, surveying long-term minor to moderate benefits (same as A and B)
- Non-breeding management protocols = long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial
- Seasonal restrictions = minor benefits
- Recreational uses moderate to major adverse
- Night restrictions = long-term, moderate, beneficial (reconcile with alternative B)
- ORV use resulting in more predators = long-term moderate adverse