


From: [Thayer Broili](#)
To: [Doug McGee](#)
Cc: [Britta Muiznieks](#); [Darrell Echols](#)
Bcc: [Mike Murray](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: please discuss
Date: 10/09/2009 02:07 PM
Attachments: [CAHA CH 2.x04.Species Mgmt Table-092409.doc](#)

Thanks. If either of you (Doug and Britta) have a more thoughts on this, let me/Darrell know by early next week (Tuesday).

Thayer Broili
Chief of Resource Management
Cape Hatteras National Seashore
Phone 252-473-2111 ext.137
Fax 252-473-2595
▼ [Doug McGee/CAHA/NPS](#)

Doug McGee/CAHA/NPS

10/09/2009 01:24 PM

To Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS
cc Britta Muiznieks/CAHA/NPS
Subject Re: Fw: please discuss 

Thayer,
If we need to prioritize these AM strategies (as I understand Mike's email):

- 1. Vegetation management:** As a pilot project, an adaptive management study will be developed to evaluate methods for managing vegetation and improving habitat and wildlife access to available habitat in the Cape Point dredge pond area. The applicability and potential effectiveness of such measures at other locations will be determined. (**South Beach should be a priority candidate for this, because the extent and duration of the closures for the past two seasons has caused/allowed vegetation to encroach onto the upper beach and ORV traffic did nothing to knock it back last winter.**)
- 2. Habitat management:** As a pilot project, an adaptive management study will be developed to evaluate methods of improving shorebird nesting and/or foraging habitat at one location in the Seashore by applying dredge material or by moving/manipulating sand or water at the site. The applicability and potential effectiveness of such measures at other locations

will be determined.

- 3. Enhanced predator management:** An adaptive management study will be developed to evaluate whether predator management actions to be implemented under the (proposed) predator control program for protected species management are effective as is, or whether enhanced measures (such as managing avian predators or ghost crabs) would be beneficial and effective, or are necessary to achieve the desired future conditions for species protection.
- 4. Colonial waterbird social attraction:** As a pilot project, an adaptive management study will be developed to evaluate the effectiveness of using colonial waterbird decoys and audio-attraction to establish or re-establish colonial waterbird colonies in suitable habitat.
- 5. Piping plover chick fledge rate:** An adaptive management study will be developed to evaluate the short-term performance target of 1.0 chick fledged per breeding pair, as well as the 1.5 chicks fledged per pair productivity rate identified in the recovery plan, to determine what productivity rate is realistically attainable and would provide for a growing population at the Seashore over the long term. If the actual productivity rate is not sufficient to achieve the desired future conditions for piping plover, it will be determined what management actions (e.g., frequency of monitoring; size or timing of buffers) need to be changed in order to achieve the desired results.
- 6. Piping plover chick buffer distance:** As stated in the piping plover recovery plan, where several years of data document that piping plovers on a particular site feed in only certain habitat types, USFWS may provide written concurrence that vehicles pose no danger to plovers in other specified habitats on that site. An adaptive management study will be developed to evaluate whether a reduced ORV or pedestrian buffer distance (i.e., less than that stated in this plan) after a certain time period, such as 2 weeks after chicks have hatched, would be adequate to prevent disturbance of piping plover chicks by

ORVs and/or pedestrians using adjacent areas during daylight hours.

- 7. Pass-through buffers during the incubation period:** An adaptive management study or studies will be developed to evaluate whether a reduced buffer distance is adequate to prevent disturbance caused by ORVs driving past piping plover, American oystercatcher, or colonial waterbird nest sites if all other recreation (e.g., pedestrians, pets) is prohibited within the reduced buffer, and to determine whether a reduced buffer is adequate to prevent disturbance caused by pedestrians walking below the high tide line past piping plover, American oystercatcher, or colonial waterbird nest sites.

The last two do little to meet DFCs and are more access-related and could be chopped and added to other management plans (my recollection is that they are already in sections of the ORV plan?).

I'm not sure this one needs mentioning under the AM section as it's redundant:

Change in protected species status: If a significant change were to occur in the status of protected shorebird species (e.g., listing or de-listing), as part of the periodic review process described at the end of this table there would be a systematic re-evaluation of the related species management actions identified in this plan to determine what changes in management, if any, are appropriate.

Change in status **must be** addressed in review, as it's already stated as such in the section titled "Periodic Review".

Doug McGee
Lead Avian BioTech
Resource Management Division
Cape Hatteras National Seashore
P.O. Box 190 Buxton, NC 27920
(252) 475-8315

▼ [Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS](#)

Thayer
Broili/CAHA/NPS

To Doug McGee/CAHA/NPS@NPS

cc

0024365

10/09/2009 11:21 AM Subject Fw: please discuss

Thayer Broili
Chief of Resource Management
Cape Hatteras National Seashore
Phone 252-473-2111 ext.137
Fax 252-473-2595

----- Forwarded by Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS on 10/09/2009 11:21 AM -----

**Mike
Murray/CAHA/NPS**

10/05/2009 08:01 AM

To Darrell Echols/CAHA/NPS@NPS
cc Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS@NPS, Doug
McGee/CAHA/NPS@NPS
Subject please discuss

Darrell,

When you discuss the draft Desired Future Conditions for colonial waterbirds (Tim Pinion's draft) with Thayer and RM staff, also please discuss the "Adaptive Management Initiatives" (for birds) on page 8 of Table 5 Species Management Strategies for the ORV DEIS (attached). There are a number of initiatives identified in the plan. All seem worthwhile; however, the way the section is worded, it indicates we will do everything listed. My question: Is that a realistic commitment to make over a 10-15 year period? If not, do we need to pare down the list to a smaller number of the most important items, or do we need to qualify the wording (e.g., change "will" to "would" or something similar). On the other hand, the AM initiatives would become meaningless if we were to be too noncommittal and substitute "may" for "will" in every item. It would have the effect of a discretionary conservation measures, which sound good but doesn't mean it would actually get done. I think we need to make a clear commitment to do some AM initiatives over a 10-15 year period; I'm just not sure the number of initiatives listed is realistic, so maybe we need to reduce the number. In contrast to the AM initiatives for birds, the AM initiatives for sea turtles on page 11 seem reasonable and realistic to me, and I can envision getting them done.

In any case, please discuss with Thayer and staff, and submit comments to Louis Berger (and copy me) on any modifications of this section.



CAHA CH 2.x04.Species Mgmt Table-092409.doc

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.