

CAHA#
2891

"Fox, Lori"
<lfox@louisberger.com>
12/23/2009 11:07 AM

To "Mansfield, Carol A." <carolm@rti.org>, "Wetmore, Doug"
<dwetmore@louisberger.com>,
<Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov>
cc "Loomis, Ross" <rloomis@rti.org>

bcc

Subject RE: exec summary with my and Mike's comments

Thanks for the fast input Carol! With those edits, I think we are good to go.
Have a great holiday!

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

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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mansfield, Carol A. [mailto:carolm@rti.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2009 7:46 AM
To: Fox, Lori; Wetmore, Doug; Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov
Cc: Loomis, Ross
Subject: RE: exec summary with my and Mike's comments

Hi Lori,
I liked E and F. Below I rewrote C and D to be like E and F (make it clear that the alternatives are better relative to A and B). I highlighted my changes in yellow. I think the summary table needs to be updated now.

For C, I deleted "Relative to A and B" from the text and changed the conclusion to read:
"Adverse impacts to preservation values would be less under alternative C, relative to alternatives A and B, and overall preservation values would be long-term, minor adverse, with long-term beneficial impacts from the measures taken to protect sensitive species at the Seashore."

For D, the text is fine, but I revised the conclusion text (I highlighted my changes in yellow).

"Adverse impacts to preservation values would be less under alternative D, relative to alternatives A and B, and overall preservation values would be long-term minor adverse, and the closure of sensitive areas to ORVs under alternative D year-round should substantially increase the probability of long-term, beneficial impacts relative to all other alternatives."

Thank you for bearing with me through all these changes, Carol

-----Original Message-----

From: Fox, Lori [mailto:lfox@louisberger.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2009 6:23 PM
To: Mansfield, Carol A.; Wetmore, Doug; Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov
Cc: Loomis, Ross
Subject: RE: exec summary with my and Mike's comments

Ok, re-wrote D, E, and F. Carol, in the AM can you take a quick look and let me know your thoughts, I hope the re-write makes it clear. It is a tad repetitive, but the park really seems to like the "overall" statement at the end, and that is what I was trying to get it. Let me know what you think. We are trying to wrap this up tomorrow as early as possible, so if you can't get to this in the morning please let me know.

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 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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mansfield, Carol A. [mailto:carolm@rti.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2009 11:58 AM
To: Fox, Lori; Wetmore, Doug; Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov
Cc: Loomis, Ross; Mansfield, Carol A.
Subject: RE: exec summary with my and Mike's comments

Hi Lori,
It is a good thing you are reading over this. I meant to keep whatever impact levels you specified, but it looks like the word "negligible" had been deleted

but when I copied it to the email it was undeleted and then I put it back in the document.

Anyway, your version of alt. C sounds good and needs to be fixed in the summary table.

For D, how about: Alternative D provides enhanced long-term protection for the plant and animal communities with the year-round closure of sensitive areas to ORV use in the Seashore. The impact on preservation values would be long-term, beneficial for the United States as a whole as a result of stronger resources management measures. Continued ORV and other recreational use would have long-term, minor, adverse impacts where this use overlaps with sensitive resources. The closure of sensitive areas to ORVs under alternative D year-round should substantially increase the probability of long-term, beneficial impacts relative to all other alternatives.

For all the alternatives, the wording "Relative to A and B...impacts would be long-term, mild, adverse.." to me made it sound like the alternatives would be worse than A and B -- that the incremental impact of C,E and F was adverse relative to A and B. I may have this wrong, but I thought that for plovers at the very least the incremental impact of the action alternatives was beneficial relative to A and B. When I took out the phrase "Relative to A and B", then we had 3 or 4 sentences and a final sentence summing up the 3 or 4 -- which seemed repetitive, which is why I deleted it. It is a little hard to see with all the track changes, though.

If you think we need a summary sentence in the text describing preservation values I defer to your judgment.

Thanks for all the good comments and proofreading, Carol

Carol Mansfield, Ph.D. | Senior Economist | RTI International Social and Statistical Sciences Division | Hobbs Building, 3040 Cornwallis Road | Durham, NC 27709 P 919-541-8053 | F 919-541-6683 | carolm@rti.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Fox, Lori [mailto:lfox@louisberger.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2009 12:26 PM
To: Mansfield, Carol A.; Wetmore, Doug; Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov
Cc: Loomis, Ross
Subject: RE: exec summary with my and Mike's comments

Thanks Carol,

I am not sure if the text you pulled was the entire preservation section, or just the summary table (which in some cases they are the same), So my questions on the below are:

1. For alternative C - how do we get to negligible adverse impacts? I had "Relative to alternatives A and B, the impacts of alternative C on preservation values would be long-term, minor adverse, with long-term beneficial impacts from the measures taken to protect sensitive species at the Seashore." I just ask because negligible is that the general population is unaware of any changes - is that what you think will occur under C? Both sets of text are provided below:

Revised Text:

Alternative C would provide negligible to moderate benefits to piping plover

relative to A and B due to more protective resources management measures. However, continued ORV and other recreational use, would have long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impacts on preservation values. The increased duration of beach closures in sensitive areas and increased required seasonal night driving restrictions under alternative C would increase the probability of beneficial impacts to preservation values relative to alternative A or B.

Original Text:

Alternative C would provide benefits to piping plover relative to A and B due to more protective resources management measures, as well as long-term minor, adverse impacts from ORV and other recreational use. Relative to alternatives A and B, the impacts of alternative C on preservation values would be long-term, minor adverse, with long-term beneficial impacts from the measures taken to protect sensitive species at the Seashore. The increased seasonal night driving restrictions under alternative C would increase the probability of beneficial impacts to preservation values relative to alternative A or B.

2. For alternative D, I think the suggested language may not get at the benefits of this alternative?

Revised Text:

Alternative D provides enhanced long-term protection for the plant and animal communities with the year-round closure of sensitive areas to ORV use in the Seashore. The impact on preservation values would be long-term, beneficial for the United States as a whole as a result of stronger resources management measures. Continued ORV and other recreational use would have long-term, minor, adverse impacts where this use overlaps with sensitive resources.

Original Text:

To the extent that alternative D provides enhanced long-term protection for the plant and animal communities in the Seashore, the impact on preservation values would be long-term, beneficial for the United States as a whole as a result of resources management measures with potential long-term, minor, adverse impacts from ORV and other recreational use. Relative to alternatives A and B, the impacts of alternative D on preservation values would be long-term minor adverse, with the closure of sensitive areas to ORVs under alternative D year-round should substantially increase the probability of long-term, beneficial impacts relative to all other alternatives.

3. For alternative E and F - the wording revision for these alts in the beginning looks good. Looks like you deleted the text I had that read "Relative to alternatives A and B, the impacts of alternative E on preservation values would be long-term, minor to moderate adverse, with long-term beneficial impacts from the measures taken by the Seashore to protect threatened and endangered, as well as special status, species." Same with alternative F Can you explain why you do not feel this text should be in the document? I guess I feel that what we are losing when we delete this is the overall conclusion. If you feel that the conclusion was not correct, we can fix that, but this section really needs a sum up to give it a little more understanding. What do you think?

Let me know if it would be easier to talk through this.

Thanks,
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 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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mansfield, Carol A. [mailto:carolm@rti.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2009 9:58 AM
To: Fox, Lori; Wetmore, Doug; Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov
Cc: Loomis, Ross; Mansfield, Carol A.
Subject: RE: exec summary with my and Mike's comments

Hi Lori, Doug and Sandy,

Two small revision comments:

1. I seem to have used different punctuation for the following that you might want to have the editor check: Long-term, minor, adverse OR long-term minor adverse OR long-term, minor and adverse
2. I also used a combination of could vs. would in describing the impacts, so the editor might want to look at that.

I made a few more edits to the preservation value descriptions. Below is the text for each alternative, which I also pasted into the summary table. See if you are okay with this.

The impact of alternative A on preservation values depends on the impact alternative A has on protected species. For piping plover, alternative A could result in long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts from resources management activities and long-term, moderate to major, adverse from ORV and other recreational use. This implies that alternative A's overall impact on preservation values for the United States as a whole could be long term, moderate, and adverse.

The increased required buffers and introduction of night driving restrictions under alternative B would lessens the impacts to preservation values relative to alternative A with long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts from resources management activities and long-term moderate, adverse impacts from ORV and other recreational use to piping plovers. Based on the impacts predicted for piping plover, the impacts to preservation value could would be long-term, minor to moderate, and adverse.

Alternative E could provide long-term benefits to piping plover relative to A

and B from resources management activities. However, continued ORV and other recreational use would have long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts to the piping plover population from. The seasonal night driving restrictions under alternative E would increase the probability of beneficial impacts to preservation values relative to alternative A. More beach access by ORVs compared to alternatives C and D would increase the probability of lower benefits for alternative E.

Resources management activities under alternative F could provide long-term preservation value benefits to piping plover. However, continued ORV and other recreational use would result in long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts to the piping plover population. The increased seasonal night driving restrictions under alternative F would increase the probability of beneficial impacts to preservation values relative to alternatives A and B. More beach access by ORVs compared to alternatives C and D would increase the probability of lower benefits for preservation under alternative F.

Thanks,
Carol

Carol Mansfield, Ph.D. | Senior Economist | RTI International Social and Statistical Sciences Division | Hobbs Building, 3040 Cornwallis Road | Durham, NC 27709 P 919-541-8053 | F 919-541-6683 | carolm@rti.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Fox, Lori [mailto:lfox@louisberger.com]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2009 4:25 PM
To: Mansfield, Carol A.; Wetmore, Doug; Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov
Cc: Loomis, Ross
Subject: RE: exec summary with my and Mike's comments

Thanks for your help this morning Carol!

I went in your version and added in the preservation value information. If you could take a quick look to confirm I didn't lose your meaning, that would be excellent!

Please do not delete any sections from the attached as it makes our version control very difficult at this point in the game. If you do have changes, if you could highlight them in blue (or any color really), that would be excellent.

Thanks,
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 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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mansfield, Carol A. [mailto:carolm@rti.org]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2009 1:13 PM
To: Fox, Lori; Wetmore, Doug; Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov
Cc: Loomis, Ross; Mansfield, Carol A.
Subject: RE: exec summary with my and Mike's comments

Hi Lori, Doug and Sandy,
Here are my edits. I ended up editing more than I thought I was going to because I was trying to get the text, conclusion and table to really match. I hope I didn't mess things up, but I deleted the document below the final summary table for socio to make it easier and faster to move around in the document.

Let me know if you have questions. I will be around for another hour probably (at home, 919-493-4842) and then I will be in the office tomorrow.

Thanks,
Carol

Carol Mansfield, Ph.D. | Senior Economist | RTI International

Social and Statistical Sciences Division | Hobbs Building, 3040 Cornwallis Road | Durham, NC 27709

P 919-541-8053 | F 919-541-6683 | carolm@rti.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Fox, Lori [mailto:lfox@louisberger.com]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2009 1:40 PM
To: Mansfield, Carol A.; Wetmore, Doug; Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov
Cc: Loomis, Ross
Subject: RE: exec summary with my and Mike's comments

No, I was handing the version off to you for your edits, and then I was going to edit it after you did.

Lori Fox
Deputy Director, Denver Operations/Senior Planner

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