| From: | Britta Muiznieks |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Mike Murray |
| Cc: | Darrell Echols; Thayer Broili |
| Subject: | Re: Please review Draft DFCs |
| Date: | 09/10/2009 05:34 PM |
| Attachments: | DRAFT DFC.PIPL.091009.park edits.docx |
|  | DRAFT DFC.SeaTurtles.091009.park edits.docx |
|  | Turtle Growth.x\|sx |
|  | IIPL pairs in NC.xlsx |

Mike-
The $2 \%$ increase is really affected by the number that you use as your baseline. I created and excel table to do the calculations and I think a $2 \%$ annual increase is different than a 20\% increase in 10 years. If we use the 5 year average from 20042008 of 77.2 then our 10 year goal will be 94.1 nests and our 20 year goal will be 114.7 nests resulting in a goal of 201nests in 50 years. Some people may have issues if our 10 year goal is less than we have had in the last 2 years but I think we can expect to have some bad years in the future which will average things out in the long run.

If we include this year's nests (average from 2005-2009) then our baseline is 89. With a baseline of 89 nests, our 10 year goal is 108 nests and 20 year goal is 132 nests resulting in a goal of 232 nests in 50 years.

## In the table you can change the baseline nest number and it will do the 2\% increase calculations for you.



I do like the idea of keeping the \% of NC nests in the table even though it is from the BO.

In the PIPL table the percent of NC total breeding pairs, the 5 year average of 24\% seems a little high. In the last 10 years we've never been over $20 \%$ in any single year. The 5 year average is around $12 \%$. Doubling this for a 5 year average of $24 \%$ seems very optimistic to me. You may have a more updated table than I do.

Call if you have any questions.
Britta Muiznieks
Wildlife Biologist
Cape Hatteras National Seashore
252-995-3740-Office
252-475-8348-Cell
252-995-6998-FAX

## - Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS

## Mike <br> Murray/ CAHA/ NPS

09/10/2009 03:17 PM

[^0]Britta and Darrell,
Please review the attached revised draft Desired Future Conditions, which I revised after our discussion yesterday. Please make any suggested changes and return to me.

## Notes:

1) I wasn't sure if we had decided to add or leave out a DFC on "Availability of Habitat for NonBreeding PIPL." I realize it may be difficult to come up with a practical and meaningful measure for it, but I decided to put it in the table and ask Tim to try to come up with something for us to react to. Since we currently have 4 units of designated critical habitat for wintering PIPL and have identified measures in our resource protection tables to monitor nonbreeding birds and provide for nonbreeding habitat protection, it makes sense to me to have some sort of related DFC.
2) For Sea Turtles, I revised the "number of nests" element to specify "loggerhead nests" and used the loggerhead recovery plan objective of an average of $2 \%$ annual increase to calculate numerical short-term (10-yr) and long-term (20-yr) nest targets. In his written comments to RegNeg, Pete Benjamin (where he recommend a goal of 200 nest in 50 years), he used the recovery plan 50-year goal of 14,000 or more nests for the northern recovery unit and the approximate distribution of nests in NC as $14 \%$ of 14,000 to come up with a $50-y r$ goal for NC of about 2,000 nests. He then assumed CAHA historically accounts for about $10 \%$ of nests in NC to come up with a proposed 50 year target of 200 nests for CAHA (i.e., he did not start with a current baseline \# of nests). To come up with the specific $10-\mathrm{yr}$ and $20-\mathrm{yr}$ target numbers I determined that we would need to use a baseline number of about 82 nests/yr to have a 50-year target of 200 nests @ 2\% increase per year. I tried various subsets of \# of nests in recent years (looked at 5year, 10-yr totals, etc.) to come up with a baseline average that would produce the desired result (2000-2009 avg is 83). I then multiplied 83 by 1.2 (assuming a $20 \%$ increase in 10 years) to get approx. 100; then multiplied 100 by 1.2 to get the 20 -year target of 120 . If you continue multiplying the new total by 1.2 a few more times, you end up with a little over 200 nests in 50 years. My gut sense is that the resulting short and long-term target nest numbers (100 and 120) are ambitious but not too unrealistic, BUT only if the statewide nest totals increase similarly. SO, rather than rely only on the $2 \%$ annual increase as a
target for the number of nests, I think it would be good to retain a "percentage of NC nests" target, just in case the recovery plan approach proves to be unrealistic. I would expect that if we meet the 10 and $20-\mathrm{yr}$ targets based on the $2 \%$ increase per year, then we would also meet the $10 \%$ of NC nests target; but I can envision the possibility of falling short on the park's targets due to factors beyond our control (such as it there is not such a big increase in NC, why would we expect to have a much bigger \% increase than the state?). If the latter were to occur, I think we would still want to at least meet the $10 \%$ of NC nests target.

In any case, please review and provide comments.


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.
Desired Future Conditions for Piping Plovers at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

| Variable $_{A}$ | Short-term target | Long-term target | Source |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of nesting pairs | 15 | 30 | Short-term target adapted |
|  |  |  | from USFWS BO*; Long |
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|  |  |  | term-target from Piping <br> Plover Recovery Plan |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fledge rate | 1.0 chicks per pair | 1.5 chicks per pair | Short-term target from |
|  |  |  | USFWS BO; Long-term <br> target from Piping Plover <br> Recovery Plam |
| Percent of NC total <br> nesting pairs | $24 \%$ | Same as short-term target | Adapted from USFWS BO**; |

## ${ }^{1}$ Short-term means 10 years (or two 5 -year periodic review cycles) after implementation of plan <br> ${ }^{2}$ Long-term means 20 years (or four 5 -year periodic review cycles) after implementation of plan

$3 \approx$ The information is in the BO under: Effects of the Action, A. Piping Plovers, Nature of the effect:
"The biologically appropriate measure of population impacts is not the size of the current remnant \& population, but rather the potential pairs and productivity foregone. The 15 pairs documented at CAHA in 1989 and comparison of current habitat with 1989 aerial photos furnish empirical evidence of potential for a population of at least five times the current number [which was 3] (i.e., 15 pairs). However, the demonstrated population growth elsewhere in the range provides evidence that the potential contributions at CAHA are two to four times that number (i.e., 30 to 60 pairs). The USFWS estimated carrying capacity for CAHA to be [sic] 30 pairs. (See USFWS, 1996a, appendix B. Actual population growth at many of the sites in other states has exceeded the projections made in this exercise.)"
${ }^{4}$ If in the future the fledge rate target in the PIPL Recovery Plan is revised (e.g., for Southern Recovery Unit), the CAHA target will be adjusted to conform with Recovery Plan.

5
${ }^{* *}$ Environmental Baseline, A, Piping Plover -section (no page \#) that says:
"Using data from 1992 to 1999 (when surveys were consistent and a period that CAHA reports to be prior to an increase in disturbance), CAHA accounted for about 24 percent of the piping plover breeding activity in North Carolina. However, using data from 2000 to 2005, CAHA accounted for only 11 percent of the piping plover breeding activity in North Carolina."
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Desired Future Conditions for Sea Turtles at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

| Variable | Short-term ${ }^{1}$ target | Long-term² ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ target | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Loggerhead Nests | 100 nests annually in 10 years (avg annual increase of $2 \%$ from 2000-2009 avg of 83) $10 \%$ of NC total | $120 z 00$-nests annually in 250 years (avg annual increase of, with $\begin{aligned} \\ 2 \% \\ \text { annual }\end{aligned}$ increase from eurrent nest numbers-20002009 avg of 83) | Short term from USFWS BO; long term aAdapted from FWS revised loggerhead recovery plan goal ${ }^{3}$. |
| Emergence Rate | 250\% | 275\% | Uses CAHA 8-yr low of $52 \%$ to set minimum threshold of 50\%; Minimum bar used to avoid conflict with "number of nests relocated" target; Long term rate increases as other threats, such as depredation, are reduced |
| Percent of NC total sea turtle nestsRatio of false crawls to nests | $5-\mathrm{yr}$ average of $10 \%$ of NC total 1:1 or less | Same as short-term targetSame as shortterm target | $\frac{\text { From USFWS BOUSFWS }}{\text { BO }}$ |
| Ratio of false crawls to nests | 5-yr average of 1:1 or less | Same as short-term target | USFWS BO (identify specific studies) |
| Number of nests relocated | 5-year average of <20\%; Minimize number of nests relocated for reasons other than "risk of daily overwash or welldocumented risk of erosion" | Same as short-term target | $<20 \%$ target from Sandy MacPherson based on work by Mark Dodd; Text in quotes from FWS recovery plan; (in 2008 CAHA relocated $17 \%$ of nests) |
| Depredation Rate | 5-yr average Annmal rate of mammalian predation on nests is $10 \%$ or less | Same as short-term target | From FWS recovery plan |
| Hatchling <br> Disorientation from Artificial Lighting | 5-yr average <br> Ppercentage of total nests with documented hatchlings disoriented by artificial lighting does not exceed 10\% | Same as short-term target | From FWS recovery plan |

${ }^{1}$ Short-term means 10 years (or two 5 -year periodic review cycles after implementation of plan)
${ }^{2}$ Long-term means 20 years (or four 5 -year periodic review cycles after implementation of plan)
${ }^{3} *$ National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of the Loggerhead Sea Turtle (Caretta caretta), Second Revision. National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD.

|  | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sunset Beach/ Bird Isle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ocean Isle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| W. Holden | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| E. Holden | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 |
| Long Beach | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ft. Caswell | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 |
| Bald Head Is. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ft. Fisher | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.5 | 1 |
| Masonboro | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 |
| Wrightsville B | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Shell Is. | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| S. Fig. 8 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| N. Fig. 8 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hutaff | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Lea | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| S. Topsail | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| N. Topsail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Onslow Beach | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 |
| Bear Is. | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Emerald Isle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ft. Macon | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 |
| Bird Shoals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cape Lookout Shackleford | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Cape Lookout South Core B. | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| Dump Island | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Cape Lookout <br> North Core B. | 14 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 15 |
| Cape Hateras Nat. Seashore | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 (2?) | 3 | 3 |
| Pea Is. NWR | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Coralla and North to Va. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 31 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 20 | 37 |
| Productivity | 0.48 | 0.54 | 0.48 | 0.17 | 0.46 | 0.65 | 0.92 |
| CAHA prs as \% of total | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.12 (0.08) | 0.15 | 0.08 |

*This table was provided by S. Cameron. In our records we have 2 pairs in 2003 and 6 pairs in 2006. In 2006 we o possible that some of the activity occurred outside the survey window which is why she used 5 pairs instead of 6 .


|  | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.08 | 0.08 |
|  | 0.11 | 0.13 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 |
|  | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| 5 Yr ave. | 0.122 | 0.126 |
| (2004-2008) |  |  |

nly had 4 nests but it is

| Baseline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nest \# | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 |
| 77.2 | 78.7 | 80.3 | 81.9 | 83.6 | 85.2 | 86.9 | 88.7 | 90.5 |
|  | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | Year 16 | Year 17 | Year 18 |
|  | 96.0 | 97.9 | 99.9 | 101.9 | 103.9 | 106.0 | 108.1 | 110.3 |
|  | Year 21 | Year 22 | Year 23 | Year 24 | Year 25 | Year 26 | Year 27 | Year 28 |
|  | 117.0 | 119.3 | 121.7 | 124.2 | 126.7 | 129.2 | 131.8 | 134.4 |
|  | Year 31 | Year 32 | Year 33 | Year 34 | Year 35 | Year 36 | Year 37 | Year 38 |
|  | 142.6 | 145.5 | 148.4 | 151.4 | 154.4 | 157.5 | 160.6 | 158.6 |
|  | Year 41 | Year 42 | Year 43 | Year 44 | Year 45 | Year 46 | Year 47 | Year 48 |
|  | 168.3 | 171.7 | 175.1 | 178.6 | 182.2 | 185.9 | 189.6 | 193.4 |

Year 9 Year 10
92.3 94.1
Year 19 Year 20
$112.5 \quad 114.7$
Year 29 Year 30
$137.1 \quad 139.8$
Year 39 Year 40
$161.8 \quad 165.0$
Year 49 Year 50197.2201 .2


[^0]:    To Britta Muiznieks/CAHA/NPS@NPS, Darrell
    Echols/CAHA/NPS@NPS
    cc Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS@NPS
    Subject Please review Draft DFCs

