Chapter 3 Comments
Mike Murray 11/03/09

Page 131, lines 7-8: where it says: "After hatching, the broods are monitored a few hours in the morning and a few hours in the afternoon until the chicks have fledged or are lost." Need to provide some context. Is this under the interim strategy (for which Table 2 of the FONSI describes continuous daylight monitoring for the first week, etc., so what is stated above is not in conformance with the stated monitoring plan) or monitoring under the consent decree, which has the larger buffers? In other words, does what is stated comply with whatever the applicable guidance prescribe? (May need Britta to suggest clarifying language.)

Page 147, lines 39-42: reference to anecdotal records about ghost crabs. Wording is okay, but it reminds me that there was a reference to a "ghost crab study at the Seashore" in one of the other Chapters (sorry, I don't remember which one) that I had meant to comment on, as follows: Which Seashore? The context for it made it sound like is was at CAHA, but I don't recall any ghost crab research at CAHA. If possible, please locate that other reference and clarify in the text if that study occurred at CAHA or some place else, and , if needed, adjust the wording accordingly so the context is clear.

CH 4

Page 156, line 38: "Lighting Pollution" sounds strange. Should it be "Light pollution"? (Use whatever term that the Night Skies crew recommends.

Page 158, lines 19-20: Need fact check on "13 to 109 sets of tracks inside closures, and 4 to 146 incidents of sea turtle fencing vandalism…" Underlined data doesn't sound correct. Either the number of the kinds of incident may be incorrect. There are usually many more sets of tracks than acts of vandalized fencing. Hard to believe we've had 146 fencing vandalism incidents in one year (we had 6 in 2008 and 11 in 2009).

Spare

verify

Page 158, line 26: something wrong with: "…two occurrences acts of deliberate violations…" Either delete "occurrences" or "acts."

Page 163, line 5. a period is needed after "…demissa)"

Page 163, line 27: Change "sustained" to "experienced" *(for clarity)*

Page 165, Ocracoke Island table, "Total/average" line: BOLD totals for each column to be consistent with how subsequent "total" rows are shown in table.

Page 167, line 16: change "is conducting" to "conducted"

Page 171, Table 21, last row: "Meyers 2005" I know this is from USGS protocols. Just want to be sure the correct location for Meyers work. Did Meyers the AMOY protocol for CAHA and make the 200 m recommendation specifically for CAHA? Or, is Meyers a reference quoted in the USGS protocols for CAHA, but Meyers conducted the study some place else?

yes, but [illegible] USGS
Sabine + others work

Page 171, line 15: "…killed during the 2003 and 2004 breeding seasons at the Seashore by …" Which Seashore? The text above bounces back and forth between CAL and CAHA, so it is unclear which "Seashore" being referred to.

Page 174, Table 22: Most of the "Totals" for each year are wrong (based on a quick manual addition) Need to check the math.

Page 179, line 44: "...crushing of a least tern egg by an ATV (NPS 2008h)." Is "ATV" correct? My recollection of the one deliberate violation in 2008 was that it involved an ORV (ATV's are prohibited, and though we do some a few occasionally; I don't remember that being the case.) Maybe Britta can confirm. July 30, 2008 - from news release

Page 180, Table 24: The Erwin references are all legit but it is a bit problematic to put all our stock in one guy. Any chance of adding a few other pertinent references? (don't have info with me, so this is from memory, e.g., Paul Buckley ref. CWB (or tern?) buffers, 1979?; any others? not aware of any others — Added: Burger 1978

Page 182, line 6: (WIPL) "…Seashore supported ~~just~~ two pairs…" *(delete "just." It sounds judgmental.)*

Page 183, lines 8-9: (REKN): "…to visit ~~only~~ North Carolina…United States, *(insert "only" here)* only as a migrant…" *(more clear)*

Page 196, Figure 22: We have 2009 data through September (and soon will have it through October by Nov 10 or so). Would be helpful to include 2009 data, to the extent possible, as it reflects year #2 under the consent decree. Cyndy could send you the latest data, if needed. ?

Page 203, line 6: (add highlighted section, since the context is how much beach is open to ORVs during the summer) "…amount of Seashore beach open can vary depending on resource closures and seasonal ORV closures of village beaches, as detailed in Chapter 2…"

Page 203, line 24: (add highlighted language) "…near the three inlets in the Seashore (Oregon, Hatteras, and Ocracoke) and Cape Point are used by…"

Page 204, line 7: Check court order granting Intervenor status to confirm date. My recollection is that they requested Intervenor status in late November and it was approved by the Court on December 5, but we should use the date on the document issued by the Court. 1st page of CD says 12/18/07

Page 204, line 35: Fact check the 22.8 miles of safety closures on Hatteras. That was right before I entered on duty, but that number sounds awfully high (since that would be approx. 2/3 the totals miles on Hatteras).

Page 205, line 3: (add highlighted language) "Park staff indicated in _____ (year) that in the ~~past~~ previous 10 years…" *(A boy was hit by an ORV in 2009, so we need to specify a date or time period for which the above statement was true.)* Paul Stevens can clarify if needed.

Pages 208, 210, 212, 214, 216, and 220: Figures 26-30 and 32: I am looking at a black-and-white version, so can't tell if color coding applies to Hatteras Island or not (it should). In any case, is it possible to add the villages on Hatteras Island to the map (presumably they have zip codes). My concern is that islanders will feel insulted that we have itemized the towns in the north, as well as Ocracoke village, but have not identified any of the Hatteras villages which are the ones most likely to be affected by the plan.

RT1

Page 215, line 7: "...within the Hatteras BGs in 2000." Change "BGs" to "block groups". *(Could not find "BG" previously defined; it looks like we consistently use the term "block groups" not "BGs")*

Page 215, lines 23-24: (add highlighted language and edit as follows): "…in Hyde County (187) individuals, compared with an unemployment rate of 6.3% for North Carolina as a whole (table 35). ~~The unemployment rates for Dare and Hyde counties were slightly higher than the unemployment rate in North Carolina as a whole in 2008.~~ *(Improves clarity)*

Page 221, line 20: I'm not aware of any "private beaches." There may be a few "private" beach access points (i.e., not open to the general public), but the beaches are public under NC public trust lands doctrine (area between high and low tide is public land). Either delete "private" or say "…private beach access points…"