# **MOUNT WASHINGTON STATE PARK**

TIP-TOP A HOUSE HISTORIC SITE () ADAMS SUMMIT BUILDING & SNACK BAR \$

#### **Draft Assessment Presentation**

HOUSE

Presentation to the Mount Washington Commission

March 14, 2025



### PRESENTERS

- JOSEPH PERSECHINO -TIGHE&BOND
- VESNA MANEVA -TIGHE&BOND
- KIM BARNETT LDA

### GOALS

- 1. INTRODUCE THE ORGANIZATION OF THE DRAFT ASSESSMENT
- 2. REVIEW TOP-LINE FINDINGS





### ORGANIZATION OF THE DRAFT ASSESSMENT

- 1. BUILDINGS & BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE
- 2. SITE FACILITIES
- 3. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
- 4. NATURAL RESOURCES





# DRAFT BUILDING ASSESSMENT

#### RESTROOMS

MOUNT WASHINGTON STATE PARK

#### BUILDINGS

- Exterior Envelope
- Structural Conditions
- Code Compliance
- Interior Finishes and Equipment
- Visitor & Staff Experience
- Storage & Maintenance Needs

### BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

- HVAC
- Plumbing
- Electrical
- Fuel Tanks

### DRAFT BUILDING ASSESSMENT Sherman Adams Building



![](_page_4_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### EXTERIOR CONDITIONS (Envelope, Structure, Code)

#### • Roof leaks

- Deteriorated chimneys
- Uneven roof pavers
- $\circ~$  Leaking door at observation tower
- Windows on lower level in poor condition
- Spalled façade concrete

![](_page_5_Figure_8.jpeg)

#### EXTERIOR CONDITIONS (Envelope, Structure, Code)

- o Roof leaks
- Deteriorated chimneys
- Uneven roof pavers
- $\circ~$  Leaking door at observation tower
- $\circ$   $\,$  Windows on lower level in poor condition  $\,$
- Spalled façade concrete

![](_page_6_Picture_8.jpeg)

- Restroom capacity is insufficient at peak volumes (train arrivals)
- Lack of storage for food service and retail
- Inconsistent interior signage
- Existing non-conforming code conditions
  - Unprotected penetrations
  - $_{\odot}\,$  Fire alarm system coverage
  - Accessibility deficiencies
- Staff quarters show signs of wear & tear

![](_page_7_Figure_10.jpeg)

#### INTERIOR CONDITIONS (Code, Finishes & Equipment, Visitor **Experience, Storage & Maintenance)**

- Restroom capacity is insufficient at peak volumes (train arrivals)
- Lack of storage for food service and retail
- Inconsistent interior signage
- Existing non-conforming code conditions
  - Unprotected penetrations
  - Fire alarm system coverage
  - Accessibility deficiencies
- Staff quarters show signs of wear & tear

Table 9: Ground Floor Plumbing Fixture Calculations (Public)										
Floor	Occupant	Classification	Water Closets		Male Urinals <sup>A</sup>	Lavat	ories	Drinking	Service	
	Load		Female	Male	(SUBSTITUTION)	Female	Male	Fountains	Sink	
Ground Floor (Public)	276	A-3 (Gathering)	1 per 65	1 per 125	0.67	1 per 200 1 per 200		1 per 500	1	
		Required fixtures	2.12	1.10	0.74	0.69	0.69	0.552	1	
	Total Required Fixtures		3	2	1	1	1	1	1	
	Total Provided Fixtures		3	2	1	1	1	0	1	

<sup>A</sup> Permitted to be substituted for male water closets

Table 10: First Floor Plumbing Fixture Calculations (Public)										
Floor	Occupant	01	Water Closets		Male Urinals <sup>A</sup>	Lavat	ories	Drinking	Service	
	Load	Classification	Female	Male	(SUBSTITUTION)	Female	Male	Fountains	Sink	
	323	A-3 (Gathering)	1 per 65	1 per 125	0.67	1 per 200 1 per 200 1		1 per 500	1	
First Floor (Public)		Required fixtures	2.48	1.29	0.87	0.81	0.81	0.646	1	
	244	A-2 (Dining)	(Dining)         1 per 75         1 per 75         0.67         1 per 200         1 per 200         20		1 per 200	1 per 500	1			
		Required fixtures	1.63	1.63	1.09	0.61	0.61	0.488	1	
	38	Mercantile	1 per 500	1 per 500	0.50	1 per 750	1 per 750	1 per 1000	1	
		Required fixtures	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.038	1	
	Total Required Fixtures		5	3	2	2	2	2	1	
	Total Provided Fixtures		6	2	3	4	4	1	1	
A Permitted	to be substit	uted for male water	closets							

#### **Plumbing Fixture Calculations**

![](_page_8_Picture_15.jpeg)

**First Floor Public** Restrooms

![](_page_8_Picture_17.jpeg)

**Ground Floor Public** Restrooms

- Restroom capacity is insufficient at peak volumes (train arrivals)
- Lack of storage for food service and retail
- Inconsistent interior signage
- Existing non-conforming code conditions
  - Unprotected penetrations
  - Fire alarm system coverage
  - Accessibility deficiencies
- $_{\odot}\,$  Staff quarters show signs of wear & tear

![](_page_9_Picture_10.jpeg)

- Restroom capacity is insufficient at peak volumes (train arrivals)
- Lack of storage for food service and retail
- Inconsistent interior signage
- Existing non-conforming code conditions
  - Unprotected penetrations
  - $_{\odot}\,$  Fire alarm system coverage
  - Accessibility deficiencies
- $_{\odot}\,$  Staff quarters show signs of wear & tear

![](_page_10_Figure_10.jpeg)

- Restroom capacity is insufficient at peak volumes (train arrivals)
- Lack of storage for food service and retail
- Inconsistent interior signage
- Existing non-conforming code conditions
  - Unprotected penetrations
  - $_{\odot}\,$  Fire alarm system coverage
  - Accessibility deficiencies
- $_{\odot}\,$  Staff quarters show signs of wear & tear

![](_page_11_Figure_10.jpeg)

- Restroom capacity is insufficient at peak volumes (train arrivals)
- Lack of storage for food service and retail
- Inconsistent interior signage
- Existing non-conforming code conditions
  - Unprotected penetrations
  - $_{\odot}\,$  Fire alarm system coverage
  - Accessibility deficiencies
- $_{\odot}\,$  Staff quarters show signs of wear & tear

![](_page_12_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_16.jpeg)

#### HEATING

- Parks Department Area heating system is in good condition
- Observatory Area Boilers, pumps, and water heater are at the end of their useful life.
- Deteriorated chimneys

![](_page_13_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### VENTILATION

- Building was designed with only natural ventilation
- Toilet rooms recirculate air through filters
- Observatory's Museum lacks ventilation
- Pack room lacks ventilation
- Kitchen Hoods lack code-compliant makeup air
- Emergency Generator intake and exhaust are controlled manually

![](_page_14_Picture_8.jpeg)

#### PLUMBING

- $\circ$  Piping corrosion
- No fire sprinklers -except in Observatory's living quarters
- $\circ~$  Kitchen fire suppression system maintenance
- Visual intrusion of propane tank

![](_page_15_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### **ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS**

- Electrical infrastructure generally in new and excellent condition
- Emergency / Standby power for entire summit

![](_page_16_Picture_4.jpeg)

### DRAFT BUILDING ASSESSMENT Tip-Top House

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_3.jpeg)

### **TIP-TOP HOUSE**

#### **EXTERIOR CONDITIONS**

- Accessibility deficiencies
- $\circ~$  Windows on west elevation leak
- Heavily weathered wood components.
- $\circ~$  Roof is likely beyond its service life.

#### **INTERIOR CONDITIONS**

- $\circ~$  Post to beam insufficient connections
- Moisture evident on interior materials
- $\circ~$  Humidity and musty smell

![](_page_18_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_14.jpeg)

### **TIP-TOP HOUSE INFRASTRUCTURE**

#### **HEATING & VENTILATION**

- New oil tanks; defunct furnace
- Significant humidity challenges

#### PLUMBING

- $\circ~$  No water service
- No restrooms
- $\circ~$  No fire protection system

#### ELECTRICAL

 $\circ~$  Ongoing wiring upgrades

![](_page_19_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_11.jpeg)

### DRAFT BUILDING ASSESSMENT Yankee Building Communications & Maintenance Facility

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **YANKEE BUILDING**

#### **EXTERIOR CONDITIONS**

- Heavily spalled concrete on ground floor
- Shingles missing, broken, severely weathered
- $\circ~$  Windows in poor condition
- $\circ~$  Roof above the third floor leaking

![](_page_21_Picture_6.jpeg)

### **YANKEE BUILDING**

#### **INTERIOR CONDITIONS**

- Unenclosed primary egress stairwell
- Non fire-rated corridor walls and doors
- Headroom deficiencies
- No sprinkler protection
- Water leaks
- $\circ~$  Damage to fireproofing floor panels
- Notched structural members

![](_page_22_Picture_9.jpeg)

### YANKEE BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

#### **HEATING & VENTILATION**

- $\circ~$  HVAC systems in poor condition
- Furnaces have exceeded their useful life
- Fan cooling not sufficient.

#### PLUMBING

- $\circ~$  Failed septic tank and leach field
- No fire protection system
- Yankee well out of use, pump is broken

#### **ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS**

- Ground wiring potentially not to code
- Retired Emergency Generator's air supply and cooling

![](_page_23_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_14.jpeg)

### DRAFT BUILDING ASSESSMENT Foundations of the Former Power House and Former WMTV Building

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_2.jpeg)

### FORMER BUILDING FOUNDATIONS

# FOUNDATION CONDITION AND REUSE POTENTIAL

- Former Power House foundation in poor condition, not suitable for reuse
- Former WMTV Building foundation appears to be in good condition, potentially suitable for reuse

![](_page_25_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_5.jpeg)

### DRAFT BUILDING ASSESSMENT Fuel Tanks

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

### **FUEL TANKS**

#### TANKS KEY FINDINGS

#### Tank Farm Tanks (Installed in 1945)

- Two out of the five Aboveground Storage Tanks (ASTs) are out of service due to age and condition.
- Various issues: moderate to severe corrosion, venting, concrete containment dike issues, labeling, etc.

#### Tanks 12, 15, 17, 19 at Sherman Adams & Yankee Building

- Venting issues venting inside building, manifolded vents, no emergency vents.
- Grounding issues.
- Level gauge and leak detection issues.

#### Tanks 18A&18B at Tip-Top House

 $\circ~$  New and will be activated upon building renovation.

![](_page_27_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_12.jpeg)

# SITE FACILITIES ASSESSMENT

- Site Circulation
- Amenities and Wayfinding
- Stormwater

![](_page_28_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### SITE ARRIVAL AND CIRCULATION

- Nearly 300,000 visitors per year combined arrivals via the Auto Road and Railway
- Visitation concentrated in 5 months: late May – mid October.
- Numbers of hikers and off-season visitors are difficult to assess

![](_page_29_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### **ARRIVAL VIA AUTO ROAD**

- Gravel parking areas (200-space) over capacity during peak visitation
- Challenging stair or road walk to summit
- Inadequate wayfinding to accessible parking
- $\circ~$  Visitors without HC plates often drive to the top
- Inadequate wayfinding to Visitor Center

![](_page_30_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **ARRIVAL VIA RAILWAY**

- Large groups cause bursts of crowding
- Railway visitors depend highly on shelter in the Visitor Center during inclement weather.

![](_page_32_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### ACCESSIBILITY

- Gravel surfacing is not wheelchair user-friendly
- Steep path to Observation Deck; dislocated pavers
- Uneven paving at path to Tip-Top House
- Summit Point is challenging to reach due to rocky terrain.

![](_page_33_Picture_6.jpeg)

Gravel surfacing at the Summit plateau

![](_page_33_Picture_8.jpeg)

Ruts is loose gravel left by wheelchair wheels

![](_page_33_Picture_10.jpeg)

Steep path (12% slope) to Observation Deck

![](_page_33_Picture_12.jpeg)

Dislocated uneven pavers at Observation Deck

![](_page_33_Picture_14.jpeg)

Uneven paving at the path to Tip Top House

![](_page_33_Picture_16.jpeg)

Rocky terrain at the Summit Point

### SITE FACILITIES: VISITOR EXPERIENCE

#### SITE FURNISHINGS

- Sparse site furnishings
- $\circ~$  No accessible picnic tables and viewing scopes
- Portable toilets in Conex boxes

![](_page_34_Picture_5.jpeg)

Benches at Visitor Center

![](_page_34_Picture_7.jpeg)

Adirondack Chairs near Cog Landing

![](_page_34_Picture_9.jpeg)

Picnic Table near Visitor Center

![](_page_34_Picture_11.jpeg)

Picnic Table near Yankee Building

![](_page_34_Picture_13.jpeg)

Portable toilets near the Summit Stage Office

![](_page_34_Picture_15.jpeg)

Flagpoles at former Visitor Center Entry

![](_page_34_Picture_17.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_18.jpeg)

### SITE FACILITIES: VISITOR EXPERIENCE

#### SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING

- Numerous site signage: building names, wayfinding, feature markers, trailhead markers, informational signs.
- Lacks unified and consistent design standards, fabrication standards, and branding
- $\circ~$  No educational / interpretive site signs
- $\circ~$  No visitor site map
- $\circ~$  No hazard signs at the old foundations

![](_page_35_Picture_7.jpeg)

No signage at exposed / partially filled foundations.

![](_page_35_Picture_9.jpeg)

Visitor Center Main Entry Sign

![](_page_35_Picture_11.jpeg)

Tip-Top House Sign

![](_page_35_Picture_13.jpeg)

Cluster of directional signs near Tip-Top House

![](_page_35_Picture_15.jpeg)

Visitor Center Secondary Sign

![](_page_35_Picture_17.jpeg)

Yankee Building Sign

![](_page_35_Picture_19.jpeg)

Directional sign to Visitor Center entrance

### SITE FACILITIES: VISITOR EXPERIENCE

#### **SCENIC ASPECTS / VIEWS**

- Scenic Impairments:
  - o Utilitarian elements / propane tank
  - Deteriorated Yankee Building and prefab structures
  - o Broken foundations
  - Wide expanse of gravel surfacing

![](_page_36_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_10.jpeg)

# SITE FACILITIES : STORMWATER

#### **STORMWATER ISSUES**

- Ground surfaces promote infiltration
- Stormwater infrastructure is minimal
- Erosion and migration of gravel
- Several noted drainage issues

![](_page_37_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT METHOD**

 ASTM E1527-21 Phase I ESA process to identify existing or potential recognized environmental conditions (RECs) associated with current or past activities.

#### **RECOGNIZED ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS (RECs)\*:**

- The presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products due to a release to the environment;
- The **likely presence** of hazardous substances or petroleum products due to a **release or likely release** to the environment; or
- The presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment.

\*ASTM Phase I Standard term

![](_page_39_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_10.jpeg)

#### **REC SUMMARY**

- 1. Historical fires in 1908 and 2003
- 2. Coal and ash impacts along the railroad corridor
- 3. Potential hazards at Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS)
- 4. Septic tank and sand filter at Yankee Building
- 5. Waste/chemical management practices at Yankee Building and Sherman Adams Building
- 6. Malfunctioning oil tank gauge in Sherman Adams Building
- 7. Power House foundation bulkhead (petroleum odors)
- 8. Historic wastewater discharges prior to current wastewater facility construction
- 9. Historic groundwater contamination at inactive Yankee Building well

![](_page_40_Figure_11.jpeg)

#### **REC 1: HISTORICAL FIRES**

![](_page_41_Picture_2.jpeg)

WMTV after fire. Fire on Mt. Washington, The "Rock Pile" goes dark, by Cheshire County DX ARC.

![](_page_41_Picture_4.jpeg)

Ruins of the Among The Clouds Office and Printing Press Douglas Philbrook Collection; Fire on the Summit: 101 Years Ago, by Rick Russack.

#### REC 2: COAL/COAL ASH IMPACTS TO GROUND SURFACE

![](_page_41_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### **REC 3: FUDS (FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITE)**

![](_page_42_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_3.jpeg)

Source: Mount Washington Icing Research Facility, DERP-FUDS No. D01NH0308, NHDES #200106016, Limited Site Assessment, September 2005, Figure 3 *Site Plan Prior to Demolition by ACOE.* 

#### **REC 4: YANKEE BUILDING SEPTIC SYSTEM**

![](_page_43_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### **REC 5: CHEMICAL HANDLING AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

![](_page_43_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_6.jpeg)

REC 6: INACCURATE FUEL GAUGE SHERMAN ADAMS BUILDING

![](_page_44_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **REC 7: FORMER POWER HOUSE BULKHEAD**

![](_page_44_Picture_4.jpeg)

REC 8: HISTORIC WASTEWATER DISCHARGES PRIOR TO INSTALLATION OF CURRENT WASTEWATER SYSTEM

#### REC 9: HISTORIC JET ENGINE TESTING & JET FUEL RELEASE TO YANKEE BUILDING WATER WELL

![](_page_45_Picture_3.jpeg)

Source: https://mountwashington.org/about-us/our history

![](_page_45_Picture_5.jpeg)

Source: https://www.geaerospace.com/sites/default/files/Test-Services-Icing.pdf

![](_page_45_Picture_7.jpeg)

Source: https://www.life.com/nature/the-worlds-worstweather-photos-from-mount-washington/

# NATURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT

- Objectives
- Methodology
- Findings
  - Physical Resources
  - Biological and Aquatic Resources
  - Alpine Tundra System and Natural Communities
  - Ecological Integrity
  - Summary of Findings

### **NATURAL RESOURCES**

#### **STUDY OBJECTIVES**

- 1. Collect field data to establish a baseline condition.
- 2. Assess the integrity of existing natural communities.
- 3. Assess the vulnerability to environmental & anthropogenic stressors.

![](_page_47_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **NATURAL RESOURCES**

ton Basemap

#### METHODOLOGY

- 1. Desktop Reconnaissance
- 2. Field Data Collection
- 3. Analysis
  - Classification of systems and communities
  - "Level 2" ecological integrity assessment (EIA)

Layers ×	
Q. Search layers	
Project Area	
:: > MtWashington_BasemapFeatures •	
$\vdots$ $\checkmark$ Infrastructure $\varnothing$ .	
:: > GV BaseLayers ·	
∷ ∽ Geology ·	
SoilsResources	
ii > BedrockGeology Ø ·	
II v Recreation	
RecreationResources - Trails	
:: Recreation Inventory: Areas Ø	
III ~ Conservation ·	
∷ > WaterResources ø •	· The Storman
∷ > NHWAP 2020 •	
ii > WildlifeCorridors Ø	
∷ > TrailsImpact Ø •	
:: > WildlifeConnectivity Ø	
:: > EnvironmentalData- Invasive Plants 🚿 .	lative plant And the Plant
Conservation - CL: Protection Level Non-	Raie - Raie
Conservation Public Land	Companya 4
MH 2021 2022	Diapensa Hadani Status Housatonia Caerulea - Little bluet
Phleum Prat. Phleum Prat. Philippingenic.	se Guorantiano Leas Trype measons and Hedges Above house communary Leas Ansmerini Simple Leas Ansmerinia Hedges Above house communary Commit Simple Leas Ansmerinia Algoine heras to motivationality
Signal Antonionantino Simple	Update V Opposite Entry Family Maryline with Opposite Entry Robizean
Non-name Non-name Used Type Used Typ	ansarc. in colo

## **NATURAL RESOURCES**

#### METHODOLOGY

• After initial reconnaissance, the study was divided into nine Assessment Areas (AAs).

![](_page_49_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Figure_4.jpeg)

# **PHYSICAL RESOURCES**

#### **PHYSICAL RESOURCES**

- Topography and Elevation
- $\circ$  Geology
- Soils Classification

![](_page_50_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Figure_6.jpeg)

	1:4,800	
0	200	400
Ĩ.	1	1

Data source: New Hampshire Geographically Referenced Analysis and Information Transfer System (GRANIT) and USPWS.

### **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

#### VEGETATION

#### **o** Species Composition, Richness, Abundance

- Most of the land surface is unvegetated felsenmeer (±65% coverage over 60-acres+/.)
- 51 species were documented
- Rare and/or Vulnerable Species
  - Alpine Tundra: Exemplary Natural Community, Globally Rare
  - 39% of the native species documented are ranked as critically imperiled (S1), imperiled (S2), or vulnerable (S3) by the State of New Hampshire.
- Non-Native Species
  - 20% of the species documented are considered non-native to New Hampshire.

![](_page_51_Figure_10.jpeg)

Figure: Composition and relative abundance of dominant and non-dominant vascular plant species documented *within vegetated areas*.

### **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

#### WILDLIFE AND HABITAT

- The summit is mapped as "Highest Ranked Habitat in the State".
- Two species of butterfly are endemic to the Presidential Range and Mt. Washington: the White Mountain Arctic and White Mountain fritillary. Neither were documented during the study.
- The American pipet breeds and nests in the alpine tundra though the field assessment occurred outside of the breeding season.
- Two species of bird were observed during the field assessment: dark-eyed junco and common raven.

![](_page_52_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Picture_7.jpeg)

### **ALPINE TUNDRA SYSTEM AND NATURAL COMMUNITIES**

![](_page_53_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### ALPINE HERBACEOUS SNOWBANK/RILL

#### Alpine Tundra System

- Ecological system classified by landform, geology, hydrology
- Summit of Mount Washington is classified
   by NHB as Alpine Tundra
- Natural communities further classified by vegetation and physical conditions

![](_page_53_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_8.jpeg)

#### **DIAPENSIA SHRUBLAND**

- **o** Establish a baseline ecological condition
- Provide objective metrics to inform conservation actions, planning, and long-term monitoring
- Metrics assessed include:
  - Land use, floristic quality, native and non-native plant species richness and abundance, soil / substrate characterization, and ecosystem stressors.

![](_page_54_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### LAND USE

 Quantity of Developed, Natural, or Moderate Recreational Area

### FLORISTIC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

- Native and Non-Native Species Coverage
  - Species richness by cover-weighted average conservatism value (mean C)
  - Native and rare species have a higher C value

#### SOIL AND SUBSTRATE

- Visible evidence of human impact on soil or substrate including:
  - Erosion, sedimentation, displacement, rutting, and compaction

![](_page_55_Figure_10.jpeg)

Figure. Floristic Quality Assessment Percent native verses non-native species with cover-weighted mean C-Values

- Alpine vegetation is slow to recover from disturbance (>100 years)
- Long recovery times are a vulnerability that needs to be specially managed

#### STRESSORS

- Recreation: Trampling from off-trail uses, importance of education
- Climate Change

![](_page_56_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Figure_7.jpeg)

Figure. Corridors of Influence by existing roads, railway, parking areas and trails

#### **SUMMARY**

• The 0-4 point-based approach and A-D rating scale integrate individual metrics for each major ecological factor and an overall EIA score for each Assessment Area.

![](_page_57_Figure_3.jpeg)

Table. Overall EIA score and rating for each AA.											
	Overall EIA Score and Rating per AA										
	AAID	1-A	1-B	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Overall EIA	Score	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.2	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.7	1.9
	Ranking	B-	B-	B-	C+	B-	B-	B-	B-	B-	C-

Figure. EIA Ranking in each Assessment Area

# **NEXT STEPS**

- Workshops to discuss potential recommendations
- Developing recommendations based on workshops
- Follow up site fieldwork Summer 2025 Pending Approval
- Public Opinion Survey Summer 2025
- Launch of Visitor Survey Summer 2025.

# DISCUSSION

![](_page_59_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_59_Picture_2.jpeg)