

CAHA # 2139

Dixon, Christopher

From: Fox, Lori
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 11:48 AM
To: Dixon, Christopher
Subject: FW: notes from today's call
Attachments: CAHA Call_092010_Notes.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: CAHA Admin

Here are the notes, accept all changes and add to the admin, thanks for waiting!

Lori Fox
 Senior Planner/Deputy Director Denver Operations

Direct 303-985-6602
 Mobile 301-461-8772
 Fax 303-984-4942

The Louis Berger Group, Inc. | 535 16th Street | Suite 600 | Denver, CO 80202 | 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: Byron, Rebecca
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 8:39 AM
To: Fox, Lori
Subject: RE: notes from today's call

Lori -

I was able to fold a few of Sandy's comments into the text, but the others are at the bottom under their own category.

Thanks!

Rudi
 Rudi Byron

main 303.985.6600
 direct 303.985.6611
 fax 303.984.4942

The Louis Berger Group, Inc. | 535 16th Street I Suite 600 I Denver, CO 80202 I 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: Fox, Lori
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 1:18 PM
To: Byron, Rebecca
Subject: RE: notes from today's call

I know this is a blast from the past but I am just looking at this. The file you sent (attached) was notes for a June meeting, not a November meeting. Can you take a look and send along the November notes?

Lori Fox
Senior Planner/Deputy Director Denver Operations

Direct 303-985-6602
Mobile 301-461-8772
Fax 303-984-4942

The Louis Berger Group, Inc. | 535 16th Street | Suite 600 | Denver, CO 80202 | 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: Byron, Rebecca
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 11:33 AM
To: Fox, Lori
Subject: RE: notes from today's call

I've inserted Sandy's into mine. I put hers in track changes, so you could tell where they went in and move them to a different section if you felt they worked better elsewhere.

Rudi
Rudi Byron

main 303.985.6600
direct 303.985.6611
fax 303.984.4942

The Louis Berger Group, Inc. | 535 16th Street I Suite 600 I Denver, CO 80202 I
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: Fox, Lori
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 11:01 AM
To: Byron, Rebecca
Subject: FW: notes from today's call

Did we ever compile your notes with Sandy's notes from this call? I not we need to do that this week.

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: Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov [mailto:Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2010 11:08 AM
To: Fox, Lori
Cc: Doug_Wetmore@nps.gov; Byron, Rebecca
Subject: notes from today's call

SH notes from 092010 call (not in any particular order). Here's what i have time for right now.

1. don't use "ORV open season" e.g. p. 84 line 38 or "open to ORV's" use instead designated as a seasonal ORV route from x (date) to x (date)

2. use "all ocean beach and inlet shoreline and existing soundside ORV areas would be designated as ORV routes 24 hours per day year-round" subject to temporary resource, safety and administrative closures rather than "the entire seashore," "throughout the seashore" etc. (e.g. p. 60 line 19) for alt A and alt B's description of designated ORV routes

3. RE p. 141 1st internal review draft FEIS Cape Hatteras Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan, Table 11 Shorebird/Waterbird Buffer Summary for All Alternatives

A.. Breeding Behavior/Nest Buffer: Alternative F, keep the 75 meters for breeding behavior/nest buffer for WIPL because it is consistent with the PIPL breeding behavior/nest buffer distance. As closely related species PIPL and WIPL may have similar reactions to disturbance. Change the text of the last sentence on p. 83 lines 44-45 (narrative description of alternative F) to say "SMAs would not be designated under this alternative and one set of standard buffers, equivalent to the ML2 buffers in the other action alternatives (except for the Wilson's plover breeding behavior/nest buffer), would be used." Other locations in the FEIS the same text about "one set of standard buffers, equivalent to the ML2 buffers in the other action alternatives" needs to be similarly qualified for WIPL, if it makes sense given the context.

B. Per Britta's input, the 200 meter unfledged chick buffer based on current knowledge and experience with the 2010 breeding season is adequate protection for WIPL, even though it's less than the PIPL buffer. 2010 is the first year CAHA has fledged WIPL. The chicks were inside a large pre-nesting closure, the shoreline was closed for other species, and the buffer could move with the chicks. As the park gets more experience with WIPL it will know better what to expect of behavior. The park has the authority to enlarge buffers based on bird behavior if needed, but for the FEIS retain the 200 meter unfledged chick buffer for WIPL.

4. Table 10-1 pedestrian access below the high tide-line adjacent to prenesting closures. The issue is that it's problematic to close the area the entire length of the prenesting closure if there is just one nest buffer that's bumping out beyond the pre-nesting closure, but it's also problematic to administer if there are several buffers bumping out with little pockets between them that would be open to pedestrians. Resource mgmt staff aren't able to both monitor birds and contact pedestrians who are inside the closures and LE responsibilities often preclude them responding quickly enough to handle the pedestrian closure intrusions.

We should use text to convey that the pedestrian area below the high water line is subject to standard buffers and the NPS retains the discretion to use more restrictive measures. Check the text from the consent decree to see what it says. We should use it..

Sandy Hamilton

Environmental Protection Specialist

National Park Service - Environmental Quality Division Academy Place P.O. Box 25287 Denver CO 80225

PH: (303) 969-2068

FAX: (303) 987-6782

September 20, 2010

Comments on the CAHA First Internal Draft FEIS

Agenda:

1. Global Issues

- a. Impairment – will this document follow the interim guidance? If yes, how will we convey the impairment findings for alternatives other than the preferred (for example, alternative A) – take out interim guidance. EDQ to add alternative guidance language to Alt F.
- b. Pg 56, line 20 – Comment from MM regarding alternative F incorporating elements from other alternatives “Is this last sentence true and do we need to say it this way? Does it invite questions about which elements from which other alternatives were incorporated? Not sure I could answer such a question easily, if asked. It seems more true to say it was modified in response to comments.” Leads to a broader discussion on how we changed alternative F any why. - modified within range of alternatives analyzed in the DEIS. Based on public and agency comments – is this valid? “Based, in part, ..”
- c. Alternatives A and B – use the language “the entire Seashore” to discuss where ORV use is permitted, discuss if this should be revised and how. Add qualifying language – visitors would potentially be allowed to operate in all areas of seashore. Some beach and soundside areas. Under this alt, visitors would be allowed to potentially, on all ocean beach and some soundside areas of the Seashore 24/7,

use "all ocean beach and inlet shoreline and existing soundside ORV areas would be designated as ORV routes 24 hours per day year-round" subject to temporary resource, safety and administrative closures rather than "the entire seashore," "throughout the seashore" etc. (e.g. p. 60 line 19) for alt A and alt B's description of designated ORV routes
- d. Chapter 4 uses the term “numerous VFAs” to discuss alternative F – this term “numerous” is not a descriptor used in Chapter 2 – do we want to revise this text throughout? – could also say numerous ORV routes. Deleted numerous from text throughout. Also don't use "ORV open season" e.g. p. 84 line 38 or "open to ORV's" use instead designated as a seasonal ORV route from x (date) to x (date)
- e.

2. Specific Comments to Discuss

- a. Pg 62/63 – expand the staffing discussion to state what the staff duties would be, not just list staff positions. Group to discuss what these duties would be. – that is all we need to include here. Change “positions” to “Functions”
- b. Pg 105 – Alternative Table, discuss what areas to include under the Village, Campground and Day Use Area heading. Put qualifier in and refer to 7-1, leave mileage off. Change

heading to include VFAs or ORVs routes around. Rodanthe needs to be 1/10th south of the pier. Revert back to previous text.

- c. Pg 106 – Discuss desired language, “spits” vs. “flats” – leave it as spits.
- d. Pg 111 – Discuss how to describe vehicle and axel lengths in alternatives C and F - just revise in F, per comment.
- e. Pg118 - Discuss Britta’s comments on Table 10-1 and how they impact this section -
- f. Pg131 – Discuss comments from Britta regarding where pedestrians can go in regards to pre-nesting closures – it becomes a blanket closure, which may be too excessive. Pedestrians below high tide line in signage. EQD/Berger to put in some language to try to clarify.
- g. Pg133 – Discuss how this element should be revised, does the Seashore plan to reduce walk-throughs? – general statement for annual survey during peak nesting. Change to “colonies” Keep vague wording to increase NPS flexibility.
- h. Pg152 – Discuss rational for upgrading impact to ORV users under visitor use to “major” – (unsure of conclusion)
- i. Pg211, lines 38-41 – Will violation numbers for species closures be available for the FEIS? – Use 2009 number from reports.
- j. Pg263 – Discuss how we want to use visitor use data in this section – Just stop at July, do not use August count. Vehicle trips over the ramps: large range. ORV visitors blurs with visitor counts – says table “vehicle trips” which is accurate. Indicate that this cannot be linked to the counts coming into the park. Oregon Inlet and Ramp 44 are busiest. Talk to Carol and see what she suggests.
- k. Pg307, line 28 – Discuss the difference between foot trails and pedestrian trails – foottrails not only from parking lot over dunes (if that’s the only place used, then it makes sense). “with associated pedestrian access to the beach” Correct to say 2 unsurfaced would be hatteras inlet and south point ocracoke. Still calling out pedestrian trails at Bodie Island spit as something different

Additional questions:

Wilson's plover – different than PIPL unfledged chick buffer – rationale for AR for changes made in document. Changing text to say using ML2 buffers with exceptions, including WIPL, its 75 m bc its more reasonable.

1000m – reference to # in recovery plan, standard behavior of PIPL moving up to over 1000m. or standard is will over 200m. Stick with 1000m until meet desired future conditions.

Additional Comments from Sandy:

3. RE p. 141 1st internal review draft FEIS Cape Hatteras Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan, Table 11 Shorebird/Waterbird Buffer Summary for All Alternatives:

A. Breeding Behavior/Nest Buffer: Alternative F, keep the 75 meters for breeding behavior/nest buffer for WIPL because it is consistent with the PIPL breeding behavior/nest buffer distance. As closely

related species PIPL and WIPL may have similar reactions to disturbance. Change the text of the last sentence on p. 83 lines 44-45 (narrative description of alternative F) to say "SMAs would not be designated under this alternative and one set of standard buffers, equivalent to the ML2 buffers in the other action alternatives (except for the Wilson's plover breeding behavior/nest buffer), would be used." Other locations in the FEIS the same text about "one set of standard buffers, equivalent to the ML2 buffers in the other action alternatives" needs to be similarly qualified for WIPL, if it makes sense given the context.

B. Per Britta's input, the 200 meter unfledged chick buffer based on current knowledge and experience with the 2010 breeding season is adequate protection for WIPL, even though it's less than the PIPL buffer. 2010 is the first year CAHA has fledged WIPL. The chicks were inside a large pre-nesting closure, the shoreline was closed for other species, and the buffer could move with the chicks. As the park gets more experience with WIPL it will know better what to expect of behavior. The park has the authority to enlarge buffers based on bird behavior if needed, but for the FEIS retain the 200 meter unfledged chick buffer for WIPL.

4. Table 10-1 pedestrian access below the high tide-line adjacent to prenesting closures. The issue is that it's problematic to close the area the entire length of the prenesting closure if there is just one nest buffer that's bumping out beyond the pre-nesting closure, but it's also problematic to administer if there are several buffers bumping out with little pockets between them that would be open to pedestrians. Resource mgmt staff aren't able to both monitor birds and contact pedestrians who are inside the closures and LE responsibilities often preclude them responding quickly enough to handle the pedestrian closure intrusions.

We should use text to convey that the pedestrian area below the high water line is subject to standard buffers and the NPS retains the discretion to use more restrictive measures. Check the text from the consent decree to see what it says. We should use it.

0030335