0031423

From: Mansfield, Carol A.

To: Mike Murray@nps.gov; Doug Wetmore@nps.gov

Mansfield, Carol A.

Subject: RE: interim strategy and BCA Date: 10/26/2011 01:24 PM

Hi Mike and Doug,

It looks like I put the wrong dates in for the Interim Strategy, so we should revise the BCA to have the right dates. Section 2.3.3, first paragraph should also be revised as it refers to each no action alternative being in place for 1 year. There may be other places as well. I apologize for that, we must have been looking at the year the FONSI was signed.

The change doesn't have any impact on the analysis or the rest of the document. We did not try to forecast visitation, because we didn't have confidence in our ability to determine the number of visitors to the beach under either the action or no-action alternatives (partly because we didn't have many years of management to look at, as the paragraph states, and also because of the difficulty in identifying just the number of people on the beach not including the lighthouse visitors, etc, but including locals).

Let me know if there are other issues,

----Original Message---From: Mike_Murray@nps.gov [mailto:Mike_Murray@nps.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 3:07 PM
To: Doug_Wetmore@nps.gov
CC: Mansfield, Carol A.

Subject: Re: interim strategy and BCA

I defer to Carol about whether the edit would affect the wording about the ripple effect in the BCA. I'm under the impression, but not sure, that the BCA considered economic impacts or visitation data from 2006. In any case, the reality is that the park operated under the Interim Strategy in 2006 (and again in 2007), even though the FONSI wasn't signed until July

It wasn't clear to me where Bruce got the dates he used, which indicated the Interim Strategy was in effect from 2007 until April 30, 2008. AS he worded it, the statement is factually incorrect. Also, it is unclear if he used that time span for any particular reason. If he based the dates on when the FONSI was signed or the time period that was considered in preparing the economic analysis (if that, in fact, did not include 2006), then perhaps the statement could be reworded along the lines of: "Although the NPS began implementation of the Interim Strategy in 2006, the document was not considered "final" until issuance of the FONSI in July 2007. As a result, the ["economic analysis" or "BCA", whatever term is most correct] only considered the impacts of the Interim Strategy during its implementation between 2007 and April 30, 2008."

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.

Wetmore/DENVER/NP

Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS@NPS 10/26/2011 02:26

carolm@rti.org Subject

interim strategy and BCA

To

Mike.

I noticed that you made a change to Bruce's responses to comments on the rule. The text that you revised is straight from the Benefit-Cost Analysis. Should it be changed there and will there be a ripple effect throughout the BCA?

Many different factors cause visitation to vary across years, so a single year may not provide a reliable estimate of average future visitation. Because each no-action alternative has been in place for a limited amount

of time, we do not have a long history with which to estimate average visitation. ORV use in the Seashore was managed under Alternative A, the Interim Strategy, in 2007 (CHANGED TO "2006 and 2007") and the beginning of 2008 (THIS PHRASE DELETED), and under the Consent Decree since April 30, 2008. As a result, we use data from other sources to assess visitation under the no-action alternatives.

Doug Wetmore
National Park Service
Natural Resource Stewardship & Science
Environmental Quality Division
P.O. Box 25287
Denver, CO 80225-0287
303.987.6955 (office)
303.968.5214 (cell)