

From: [Joe DeVivo](#)
To: [Mike Murray](#)
Cc: [Britta Muiznieks](#); [Michael W. Byrne](#); [Sherri Fields](#); [Thayer Broili](#); [Margaret Carfioli](#)
Subject: Re: CAHA nonbreeding study
Date: 01/26/2009 01:52 PM
Attachments: [20071031 CAHA Nonbreeding Shorebird report.2006-2007.pdf](#)
[20071031 CAHA Shorebird Monitoring Protocol.pdf](#)

Mike (et al.)--

In answer to your questions, and some of the others that came up during our call this morning:

1. The error on page 8 is just a glitch that popped up when it got un-linked from our citation software. We'll get this fixed on the release version. As per my discussion with Mike M. this morning, we will have a cleaned-up version to you that can be distributed no later than Feb 3. This will still be a *draft* version, but will be concurrently sent out for peer review (it has already been through internal/informal review).
2. As for peer review, we didn't get this reviewed beyond internal folks. Specifically this has been sent to CAHA staff (Thayer and Britta), and Cherri Green for comment. Mike also sent it to David Rabun as well, but received no comments back.
3. The purpose of this report was twofold: to summarize Jessica's sampling data from the pilot year's worth of efforts, and to determine a minimum sampling effort that could be implemented for sampling plovers. It's important to remember that this study, while similar to the long-term monitoring efforts in terms of methodology, was done with a much greater intensity and in more places than the monitoring that is currently underway. It does, however, we do have the data to talk about the distribution of the species throughout the park as opposed to just the spit areas.
4. Though I couldn't pinpoint the discussion of distribution of the species throughout the park while we were discussing, it's actually in there on page 17. We'll expand/and clarify a bit in that section, but if asked before the 3rd, we do have park-wide location data for AMOY, PIPL, REKN, and WIPL. Red Knot was not more abundant in the spit areas relative to the general beachfront areas (even chance of seeing them in one location vs. the other); American Oystercatcher was more abundant in the spit areas, though not significantly so. We didn't have enough data to make such a determination with Wilson's Plovers. We will check and indicate whether there were any areas of concentrated observations before sending the report out for peer review, and Mike (Byrne) will be adding in maps of observations for all four species.
5. As for the protocol, we are planning on this being out the door for peer review by February 10. This has taken longer than we hoped because the IT side of things proved to be more challenging than anticipated, but the server-side work is now complete. Between now and the 10th, Emma will contact Abra to migrate your existing database onto the network data server and will work with her to ensure a seamless migration to the new data system. Once that is done I will send out an email to other park staff to arrange a time where Mike Byrne and I can come up and do a walk thru of the overall system, where to find the info you need when you need it, etc.

6. We will be asking our reviewers to complete their reviews within 30 days of receipt, and will be moving toward printing as quickly as possible. This should allow both of these reports to hit the street in the March-April timeframe that the park needs.

Joe.

Joe DeVivo
Inventory & Monitoring Coordinator, Southeast Coast Network
National Park Service
Division of Science and Natural Resource Management
100 Alabama St. SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
joe_devivo@nps.gov
<http://www1.nature.nps.gov/im/units/secn/>

404-562-3113 x739
678-858-5229 (mobile)
404-562-3310 (fax)
▼ [Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS](#)

**Mike
Murray/CAHA/NPS**

01/26/2009 09:41 AM

To Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS@NPS
cc Michael W Byrne/Atlanta/NPS@NPS, Joe DeVivo/Atlanta/NPS@NPS, Britta Muiznieks/CAHA/NPS@NPS, Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS@NPS
Subject CAHA nonbreeding study

Hi Sherri,

Would you know if this is the final report on the nonbreeding monitoring study at CAHA. I would like to share the information with the RegNeg Committee and will inevitably get the following questions:



20071031 CAHA Nonbreeding Shorebird report.2006-2007.pdf

1) On page 8, there is an **"Error! Reference not found"** statement. Is that still unresolved? Does it need to be resolved before we release the report?

2) We will get asked if the study or report was peer reviewed. How should we answer that?

While we are on the subject of nonbreeding shorebirds, I'd like to confirm the status of the nonbreeding monitoring protocol. Is the

attached document "final" or were there any additional edits needed? (I've lost track of the status of this, and we are now focusing on nonbreeding birds in the RegNeg discussions and are getting asked about NPS's monitoring procedures.)



20071031 CAHA Shorebird Monitoring Protocol.pdf

Thanks for any clarification you can provide.

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.