

From: [Michelle Baker](#)
To: [Mike Murray](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: Please edit
Date: 12/03/2008 12:28 PM

Hey Mike,

There is just one change: CAHA relocates 10 to 20 % of nests per year. In 2008 22 nests were relocated (19.6%).

If you want to make a note of this you can:

I just ran the data for relocated verses non-relocated nest successes. These numbers are not final as three nests have not been included in the data sets, but it turns out that the non-relocation numbers are better than the relocation numbers:

Emergence Success Relocated Nests: 43.1%
Emergence Success Non-Relocated Nests: 50.5%

Hatching Success Relocated Nests: 55.7%
Hatching Success Non-Relocated Nests: 58.8%

This difference can be explained by the fact that we tried to relocate nests that were laid later in the season because we knew they would be affected by storms. The relocated numbers are so low because we were right. Unfortunately, even with relocation, many of these nests had severely decreased success due to storm activity. Those nests that we relocated that hatched before the storm season had some of the highest successes of the season.

Hope this helps,

Michelle

-----Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS wrote: -----

To: Michelle Baker/CAHA/NPS@NPS
From: Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS
Date: 12/02/2008 05:15PM
cc: Britta Muiznieks/CAHA/NPS@NPS, Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS@NPS
Subject: Fw: Please edit

Michelle,

Please review the section on Sea Turtles below, which is part of a draft summary of the November RegNeg meeting. Make any edits and return to me, or confirm no edits needed. (I'll edit the other sections.)

Thanks,

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 12/02/2008 05:12 PM -----

Ona Ferguson
<oferguson@cbuilding.org>

12/02/2008 05:10 PM

To "Mike_Murray@nps.gov"
<Mike_Murray@nps.gov>
cc Sandy Hamilton
<Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov>,
Cyndy Holda
<Cyndy_Holda@nps.gov>,
Robert Fisher
<rcf@fisherics.com>

Subject: Your input

Mike,

Please let me know in the next few days if there are any factual corrections I need to make to the following segments of the November meeting summary so they are accurate.

Thanks,

Ona

SEA TURTLES (Note, this is only the segment of the sea turtle presentation and discussion in which NPS staff presented):

"Michelle Baker, CAHA staff member, shared information about turtle and turtle management on CAHA. Resource managers at CAHA relocate 10-20 turtle nests a year. Current management between May 1-September 15 includes a daily survey of turtles by staff technicians. If a nest containing eggs is found, the technician erects a small closure. Filter fencing is installed to mitigate the effect of lights on nestlings, and it is extended down to the water on Day 50. When relocating nests, resource managers follow NCMWRC guidelines. There was no statistical difference this year between success of relocated versus non-relocated nests because of the power of fall storms. Every year CAHA managers document incidents that count as take, including lighting and harassment (examples include turtles stuck in footprints or vehicle tracks, nests getting run over, and turtles ending up in parking lots). One management goal is to achieve at least a 1:1 nest to false crawl ratio. In 2008, CAHA attained this (112:103), but in 2007 it did not (82:114). False crawl numbers are difficult to capture accurately. These numbers are published in the CAHA annual report."

NPS ORV Management Alternatives

Mike Murray presented the ORV alternatives developed by NPS to meet NEPA requirements and help the Park to meet its many legal and regulatory requirements. NPS staff worked to develop a full range of reasonable alternatives for consideration during the evaluation, including two "no action" alternatives (representing the consent decree and the interim strategy) and three "action" alternatives for the NEPA Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The action alternatives were developed building on internal NPS and public scoping as well as on the workbooks submitted by members of the public. NPS is currently completing the impact analysis of the alternatives, considering impact on wildlife, geographic features, visitor experience, socioeconomic indicators, and NPS staffing requirements. The alternatives documents can be found at: <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=358&projectId=10641&documentID=25051>

The alternatives were shared with the Committee to provide information to the Committee, not to limit what the Committee develops in any way. The hope is that the Committee will develop a consensus alternative that will become a fourth action alternative to be evaluated in the DEIS. When the Committee reaches preliminary consensus, preliminary NEPA impact analysis will be prepared and shared with the Committee. Based on that analysis, the Committee will be able to adjust the preliminary consensus option before making its final recommendation.

The NPS Draft EIS (DEIS) will be released for public comment in fall 2009. The Record of Decision must be final by the end of 2010, and the final rule must be promulgated by April 1, 2011.

Committee members asked the following questions and made the following comments about the alternatives. Answers from the DFO are in italics.

- Please include Pea Island data and data on areas open but not accessible to ORVs in presentation and/or pie charts.
- What does a full-time biological employee cost? *\$35-50K/year. Implementing some of these alternatives effectively would require more three-season or year-round staff on CAHA. NPS does not yet have the funding to support the 12.0-15.0 FTE staff estimated to be needed on Alternatives C, D and E.*
- Should the Committee focus on staffing and resources? *No, please focus on developing a consensus alternative you think would work.*
- What levels of enforcement staffing would these alternatives require? *NPS is developing this information, and will share it in the DEIS if not before.*
- What are the light red lines on the land side of other colored lines on the alternatives maps? *Safety closures.*
- For Alternative C, would ORV routes be designated then closed seasonally? *Yes, or designated non-ORV during the summer and open to ORVs in the off-season.*
- Are there provisions for adaptive management in the alternatives? *Yes, NPS wants to do periodic review to the extent possible.*
- Do these alternatives consider the predicted population increase in NC of 25% in the next decade? *They consider the need for multiple access options and many other factors, but not that particular statistical prediction.*
- Would revenue from ORV permits pay for all CAHA staffing needs? *Revenue from permits can only be used to administer an ORV plan.*
- Do the pie charts guarantee X% as the maximum ORV closures? *Year-round ORV routes are unlikely to have conflicts. Pie charts represent designated areas, but overlay closures are always possible.*
- If there are permits and a seasonal carrying capacity is set, could you pay for a permit then not be allowed onto the beach? *There would not be a guarantee that every permittee can get to every part of the beach all the time. However, it is likely that limits would be reached only for a few hours on a few holidays.*
- Is NPS considering opening the north end of Ocracoke? *It is possible, with safety closures as defined in each alternative.*

Committee members gave feedback to NPS on the three alternatives in small groups. The

facilitators summarized committee small group feedback in a presentation to the Committee and the public. The presentation is available at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=358&projectId=10641&documentID=25083>