

From: [Mike Murray](#)
To: [Thayer Brolli](#); [Britta Muiznieks](#)
Subject: Fw: Draft Consultation letter
Date: 03/21/2008 10:15 AM

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.

----- Forwarded by Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS on 03/21/2008 09:15 AM -----

**Timothy
Pinion/Atlanta/NPS**

03/21/2008 08:43 AM

To Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS@NPS

cc Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS@NPS

Subject Re: Fw: Draft Consultation letter 

Hi, Sherri.

You have raised some good points here and I am copying Mike on this message so he can take a look.

I like the idea of considering renesting attempts as part of the reinitiation trigger since it gets at the issue of disturbance or "take". The difficulty, as you have pointed out, is that disturbance may not be due to any sources that are within our control. I think that carefully documenting losses due to storms, for example, will enable us to undergo a fairly straightforward reconsultation with FWS, similar to how I see us going with last year's data related to false crawl ratios for sea turtles. The high false crawls appear to be due to factors other than human disturbance since many crawls were concentrated in an area of beach closed to ORV access. As I understand it, the FWS has decided not to change false crawl reinitiation triggers or recommend changes in management considering the fact that many false crawls occurred on a closed beach. I would expect a similar reaction from FWS if we demonstrated that the reason we didn't meet a PIPL renesting target was because of a storm event.

Your concerns make me think that perhaps we should refine the trigger that currently reads: "two nests for any one breeding pair, per year," to something like: "two unsuccessful nesting attempts for any one breeding pair for reasons other than direct loss due to a storm event."

As for increasing the breeding pair target. I interpreted this as FWS attempting to show that there is an expectation of improvement with the interim plan, rather than maintaining status quo.

Thanks for raising these points.

--Tim


Tim Pinion
Wildlife Biologist and T & E Coordinator
National Park Service, Southeast Region
100 Alabama St., SW. 1924 Bldg.
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-562-3113 ext 512
Timothy_Pinion@nps.gov

▼ [Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS](#)

**Sherri
Fields/Atlanta/NPS**

To Timothy Pinion/Atlanta/NPS@NPS
cc

03/21/2008 07:53 AM
EDT

Subject Re: Fw: Draft Consultation letter 

Hi Tim

As you know, I'm on travel all this week in Calif and have attempted to review this via my bberry so I may have missed some elements of this. I'm sending this to you first so you can determine if these comments are relevant before forwarding to the park.

The first thing that jumped out at me was the inclusion of renesting attempts. Was the renesting last year from human disturbance or storms? If primarily the latter, I wouldn't think we'd want to set this type of performance target. The other issue was increasing the breeding pair target after only one year. I wonder if we should keep that target static to ensure a basis for possibly increasing it in the future. (was this one raised by the enviros as being too low?)

If these are relevant please forward to Mike.

Thx
Sherri

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld