

Wetmore, Doug

CAHA #1955

From: Wetmore, Doug
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 5:47 PM
To: 'Britta_Muiznieks@nps.gov'; Doug_McGee@nps.gov
Cc: Fox, Lori; Van Dyke, Nancy; 'Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov'
Subject: EIS questions

Hi Britta.

We had some questions on Mike Murray's comments the resource sections for the EIS and Sandy suggested that we contact you.

- Chapter 3, page 30. Table 11 and 12. It looks like all of the data for CWB nests is coming from NCWRC's monitoring efforts. On page 36, Mike asked if we had more recent data for CWB breeding performance. We have copies of many of the CWB reports that Seashore staff produced, but the data was not included in the Interim plan (or this EIS). Should we just be using the NCWRC data or should we incorporate the Seashore's data? Is it an issue of different monitoring methods? What is your recommendation on how to report the CWB data?
- Chapter 3, page 33. The title is "Descriptions of Breeding, Foraging, and Migration/Winter Roost Habitats". Mike circled "Migration/Winter Roost" and wrote "NON BREEDING?" and indicated to ask you what the best term to use would be.
- PIPL section. Breeding areas: The names of the primary breeding/monitoring areas differ depending on the document. For example, some reports refer to South Point and some to Ocracoke South, and there's also language referring to Ocracoke Inlet Spit. This happens for many of the breeding areas. Could you provide us with the most correct names for these areas and if they've been geographically defined?
- PIPL section p 19 (Figure 4 – PIPL observations inside/outside of resource closures – 2007). Could you provide the source data for this chart so I can recreate per Mike's comments?
- Chapter 2, page 23 Line 15. Buxton staff had the following comment, but provided no recommendation for altering the text. Do you have any suggestions?
 - "Commenters suggested not providing protection to the seabeach amaranth because it is a farmed plant." This comment is probably referring to the Amaranth study conducted by Claudia Jolls from 2001-2003 at CAHA, CALO and ASIS where there were outplantings of seabeach amaranth. I'm not sure if the outplanting would be considered a non-essential experimental population the same as reintroductions with animals or if plants are treated differently. We have a draft final report for this study but to my knowledge it has not been finalized.

Thanks Britta, and please let me know if you have any questions on these.

~Doug

Doug Wetmore
 Environmental Planner

Direct 303-985-6611
 Mobile 303-905-6128
 Fax 303-984-4942

X

Wetmore, Doug

From: Wetmore, Doug
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 1:58 PM
To: 'Britta_Muiznieks@nps.gov'
Cc: 'Abra_C_Zobel@nps.gov'; Fox, Lori; Van Dyke, Nancy; 'Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov'
Subject: RE: EIS questions
Attachments: CAHA Piping Plover Report (2007)-Pgs. 1-11.pdf

Thanks Britta.

Here's the table that I was referring to that I need the source data for. It's on Page 11 of the 2007 PIPL report.

I'll check with Abra on the source data for this chart and on the correct names for the breeding areas.

~Doug

-----Original Message-----

From: Britta_Muiznieks@nps.gov [mailto:Britta_Muiznieks@nps.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 1:26 PM
To: Wetmore, Doug; Abra_C_Zobel@nps.gov
Subject: EIS questions

Doug-

Something happened with the email that you sent me in that I couldn't just "reply" to it. I realized this after I had already inserted my comments so I just cut and pasted the whole thing below.

Abra-

See the blue text below. Call or email Doug W. if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Britta Muiznieks
Wildlife Biologist
Cape Hatteras National Seashore

252-995-3740-Office
252-475-8348-Cell
252-995-6998-FAX

Hi Britta.

We had some questions on Mike Murray's comments the resource sections for the EIS and Sandy suggested that we contact you.

· Chapter 3, page 30. Table 11 and 12. It looks like all of the data for CWB nests is coming from NCWRC's monitoring efforts. On page 36, Mike asked if we had more recent data for CWB breeding performance. We have copies of many of the CWB reports that Seashore staff produced, but the data was not included in the Interim plan (or this EIS). Should we just be using the NCWRC data or should we incorporate the Seashore's data? Is it an issue of different monitoring methods? What is your recommendation on how to report the CWB data?

I'm assuming you received our 2008 CWB report. If not let me know and I will forward it to you. The reason our numbers differ from NCWRC is that they try to conduct their standardized count throughout the state of NC during the last week of May which is supposed to coincide with peak nesting. Our counts will include colonies that set up after the "count window". We will have storms that come through and wipe out colonies sometimes they will renest in the same location and other times they will leave. Since these are not marked birds we do not know if all of the later nests are renesting attempts or just late nesters. Our nest numbers reflect peak nest counts for the individual colony which may differ for all the colonies in the park.

I would report it separately since different survey methods are used.

· Chapter 3, page 33. The title is "Descriptions of Breeding, Foraging, and Migration/Winter Roost Habitats". Mike circled "Migration/Winter Roost" and wrote "NON BREEDING?" and indicated to ask you what the best term to use would be.

We have been using the term Non breeding for our winter surveys. The term encompasses wintering and migratory birds. I prefer non breeding but that may just be personal preference.

· PIPL section. Breeding areas: The names of the primary breeding/monitoring areas differ depending on the document. For example, some reports refer to South Point and some to Ocracoke South, and there's also language referring to Ocracoke Inlet Spit. This happens for many of the breeding areas. Could you provide us with the most correct names for these areas and if they've been geographically defined?

We have tried (but failed) to standardize the names of locations. I know that the PIPL report differs from the CWB as far as how things are named. Abra pulled together a map with what she thought things should be called (i.e. maps of LE who came in on a detail last summer) but getting everyone to use the same name for the same location has proven to be difficult. She is out today but will be back tomorrow.

· PIPL section p 19 (Figure 4 - PIPL observations inside/outside of resource closures - 2007). Could you provide the source data for this chart so I can recreate per Mike's comments?

I don't see a figure 4 on Pg 19 (we must be looking at different versions). Again ask Abra, until just recently she was entering all the data into SECN's database and should be able to pull up the data for you.

· Chapter 2, page 23 Line 15. Buxton staff had the following comment, but provided no recommendation for altering the text. Do you have any suggestions?

I would suggest calling or emailing David Rabon from the USFWS (919)856-4520, ext 16. I was just aware of this clause because I worked on the reintroduction of Puerto Rican parrots and Hispaniolan parrots when I worked for Fish. I just know that reintroduced species are considered non-essential experimental populations and do not receive the same protection that naturally occurring populations do. Plants species are always treated differently than animal species and I have never worked with outplanted plant populations. At this point I do not know if we could distinguish seedlings of an outplanted amaranth plant from a naturally occurring plant.

The park does have an obligation to try to maintain species diversity of naturally occurring populations within the park. So even if the Park is not required by law to protect the outplanted population (check with D. Rabon), we would want to contribute to the recovery of the species and promote the protection of this species within the park. In NPS Management Policies 2006 (General Principles for Managing Biological Resources) it states that "The National Park Service will maintain as parts of the natural ecosystems of parks all plants and animals native to park ecosystems....The Service will successfully maintain native plants and animals by

-preserving and restoring the natural abundances, diversities, dynamics, distributions, habitats, and behaviors of native plant and animal populations and the communities and ecosystems in which they occur;

-restoring native plant and animal populations in parks when they have been extirpated by past human-caused actions; and

-minimizing human impacts on native plants, animals, populations, communities, and ecosystems, and the processes that sustain them.

o "Commenters suggested not providing protection to the seabeach amaranth because it is a farmed plant." This comment is probably referring to the Amaranth study conducted by Claudia Jolls from 2001-2003 at CAHA, CALO and ASIS where there were outplantings of seabeach amaranth. I'm not sure if the outplanting would be considered a non-essential experimental population the same as reintroductions with animals or if plants are treated differently. We have a draft final report for this study but to my knowledge it has not been finalized.

Thanks Britta, and please let me know if you have any questions on these.

~Doug

Doug Wetmore

Environmental Planner

Direct 303-985-6611

Mobile 303-905-6128

Fax 303-984-4942