

0024723

From: [Doug Stover](#)
To: [Mike Murray](#)
Subject: Re: Ch 4 comments
Date: 11/16/2009 12:43 PM

Mike,
Tommy make a good comment, but with the statement from Jessica McNeil "would not have a permanent effect on the integrity of any known archeological site. I don,t see how it would make it permanent effect on any archeology site (beach shipwrecks). SEAC has not addressed beach shipwreck as an archeology site and have not entered any beach shipwreck into the archeological database.

Doug Stover
Historian/Cultural Resource Program Manager
Cape Hatteras NS/Fort Raleigh NHS/Wright Brothers NMEM
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Tel: 252-473-2111x153
Fax: 252-473-2595
▼ [Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS](#)

Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS

11/16/2009 09:47 AM

To: Doug Stover/CAHA/NPS@NPS
cc
Subject: Ch 4 comments

Doug,

FYI - See below.

Mike Murray
Superintendent
Cape Hatteras NS/ Wright Brothers NMem/ Ft. Raleigh NHS
(w) 252-473-2111, ext. 148
(c) 252-216-5520
fax 252-473-2595

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure.

----- Forwarded by Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS on 11/16/2009 09:46 AM -----

Jami Hammond/Atlanta/NPS

11/15/2009 11:13 PM

To: Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS, Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS
cc: Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS
Subject

Sandy and Mike,

I got through Chapter 4 and have a few comments if it's not too late (see attached). Most comments were already addressed on the latest version that I had. Also, I put the document on plan review and had the folks commenting pull the document from PEPC, but I didn't realize that Chapter 4 was not uploaded, so I will share that with Tommy. As I said, please don't hold anything. On the chapters that they did have access to, Jessica McNeil from SEAC had a concern with the dismissal of Archeological Resources (see below) and Tommy had a few comments. Thanks for your patience. The effort that everyone has put forth is really amazing.

A general comment / question that I had was regarding impact analysis. There was a great deal of description of the actions that would normally only be included in the alternatives description - was that done because of the size and complexity of the document? The rest of my comments are in track-changes and there are only a handful.

Thanks again -

Jami

[attachment "Chapter_4_110609[1]-Hammond comments.doc" deleted by Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS]

[Jessica McNeil \(SEAC\)](#)

I have reviewed the Archeological Resources section of the CAHA ORV Management Plan EIS beginning Chapter 1, p. 29, line 33.

After due consideration, I do not feel that the archeological resources have been adequately addressed with regards to this plan. The section lists several impacts by ORV's: site's being run over by vehicles, portions of shipwrecks being removed by ORV users for firewood or other purposes, etc. The section then goes on to say that impacts such as these "would not have a permanent effect on the integrity of any known archeological sites" (ch.1, p. 30, line 30-31). Any impacts such as these would have a permanent effect on any archeological site. I therefore feel that it is inappropriate to remove the Archeological Resources from further analysis in this EIS as these impacts could be detrimental to archeological sites.

Tommy Jones (Regional 106 Coordinator) -

10-35 "rights of individuals" not "rights on individuals."

13-8 Delete "in part." Lack of formal roads was virtually the only reason residents drove on the beach, which required deflating tires and was generally inconvenient for day-to-day driving.

31-41 replace "and" with "an."

Add a statement to the effect that Section 106 is being combined with NEPA compliance if the statement is not already included.