

From: [Sherri Fields](#)
To: [Mike Murray](#); [Sandra Hamilton](#)
cc: [Peter Dratch](#); [Patricia Hooks](#)
Subject: Re: Meeting with FWS RD: Interim Strategy question
Date: 08/10/2006 06:58 PM

Mike

One of the reasons it was identified as interim was so the stakeholders would not feel that anything included in the protected species plan was off of the table during the ORV management planning process. The thought was that the reg neg could adopt the interim plan as is or come up with something different. In sum, this element would be a subset of the larger ORV management plan.

Does that help?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

▼ [Mike Murray](#)

From: Mike Murray
Sent: 08/10/2006 09:16 AM
To: Sherri Fields; Sandra Hamilton
Cc: Peter Dratch; Patricia Hooks
Subject: Meeting with FWS RD: Interim Strategy question

Hi Sherri and Sandy,

FWS Regional Director Sam Hamilton and Pete Benjamin visited CAHA yesterday to tour the park and meet with stakeholders. During discussion about the critical habitat issue, the question came up from stakeholders as to whether the CAHA interim strategy, once completed, would provide sufficient habitat protection to exclude CAHA from the critical habitat designation (answer was "it could"). It was also asked whether the document title "interim strategy" made any difference in the decision ("not sure"), which led to the question why is it called "interim strategy" instead of "management plan."

Neither Pete, Thayer nor I knew why it is called "interim strategy" and we wondered what is going to replace it? "Interim" implies it is going to be replaced by something, but everyone is under the impression that the ORV management plan is not going to revisit in detail all the species specific protective measures such as buffer distances, timing of prenesting

closures, etc. The ORV plan will likely consider the issues of closures (year-round, seasonal, etc.)) which will have some relevance for wildlife, but none of the other ORV management plans I am familiar with also serve as a protected species management plan. There is obviously some analysis in the ORV plans on how the proposed action may affect protected species.

We surmised that it is called "interim" to allow us to do it as an EA rather than an EIS, but are wondering if that means we will still need to do a protected species management plan/EIS at some point. As the BO is drafted we will have to re-consult FWS at the end of 2009 if we do not have a "permanent" plan in place. The question is what will replace it? It was suggested that we resolve the "interim" question because it may make a difference in how FWS views the plan in considering whether it is sufficient to exclude CAHA from critical habitat.

Could either of you shed some light on why it is called "interim" and how the interim strategy will be replaced by a permanent species management plan? Is there a NEPA mechanism by which the interim strategy can be "converted" into a "management plan" at a later date without having to redo the whole thing? (Sam said that the FWS sometimes use an "interim operating plan" until a conservation plan/EIS can be developed. Is that what we are doing?) Any background information you could provide would be appreciated.

(Pat, the visit went well. Sam was very generous with his time and we were able to do an overflight, meet with ORV stakeholders and 2 county commissioners at the Anglers Club, meet with Director of NC Audubon Chris Canfield and Sidney Maddock, and do a ground tour of Cape Point. I felt we able to give a thorough overview of our species protection and ORV management situation and issues.)

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

0019570

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.