

0025209

Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS

12/18/2009 04:33 PM

To Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS@NPS

cc

bcc

Subject Re: other wildlife - birds

Some that makes sense that the level of adverse impacts could reasonably be proportionately less for other nonbreeding shorebirds than for REKN; HOWEVER, there was so much discussion in the regneg NR subcommittee and integration group about nonbreeding shorebirds and the lack of protected foraging habitat (as well as references such as Collazo, etc) I expect environmental groups would contest a "negligible" adverse impact for A and B. Personally, think A and B should be at least minor to moderate and minor respectively then C-F could be negligible to minor and D negligible (or something like that).

Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Sandra Hamilton

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

From: Sandra Hamilton

Sent: 12/18/2009 04:16 PM MST

To: Mike Murray

Cc: dwetmore@louisberger.com; lfox@louisberger.com

Subject: other wildlife - birds

Hi Mike,

Doug and I just discussed why the impacts on the other non-breeding shorebird species are less than they are for REKN. Doug and Richard had discussed it previously. The primary reasons are 1) the REKN population is declining precipitously (to the point i recall that one model predicted extinction in 5 years if steps were not taken to protect their primary food resource at Delaware Bay), whereas the other species' populations are in less decline and therefore of less concern during the life of the plan, and 2) the other species do not have the same energetic (caloric) needs that the REKN do because their migrations are shorter and they can therefore tolerate more disturbance than the REKN.

The first reason is mentioned briefly in the analysis, but could be elaborated on. The second will need to be included in the discussion or assumptions. Doug is looking at it and will provide language to clarify the rationale for the difference in impacts between the other non-breeding shorebirds and REKN. I will give the two sections another look as well.

Thanks for bringing this up. We need to explain more clearly why the impacts are different, since as you pointed out the REKN and the other non-breeding shorebirds use the same areas and the level of disturbance would likely be the same.

Sandy

Sandy Hamilton
Environmental Protection Specialist
National Park Service - Environmental Quality Division
Academy Place
P.O. Box 25287
Denver CO 80225
PH: (303) 969-2068
FAX: (303) 987-6782

Fox, Lori

From: Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2009 5:35 PM
To: Wetmore, Doug
Cc: Fox, Lori; Mike_Murray@nps.gov
Subject: RE: other wildlife - birds

Thanks, Doug. That would be helpful. We want to be as accurate as we can.

Sandy

Sandy Hamilton
Environmental Protection Specialist
National Park Service - Environmental Quality Division Academy Place P.O. Box 25287 Denver CO
80225
PH: (303) 969-2068
FAX: (303) 987-6782

"Wetmore, Doug"
<dwetmore@louisberger.com>
12/18/2009 04:56 PM
To
<Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov>,
<Mike_Murray@nps.gov>
cc
"Fox, Lori" <lfox@louisberger.com>
Subject
RE: other wildlife - birds

Thanks Sandy.

I certainly do share Mike's concern regarding the disproportionate level of impacts between REKN and other bird species. Although some of these species are mentioned in the Shorebird Conservation Plan, there isn't much research out there on the effects of human disturbance. However, there seem to be some parallels between Ruddy Turnstone and REKN, with the long migration pattern and wintering stops along coastal NC. I would be happy to contact Richard and have a more in depth discussion about the species that use CAHA beaches and the potential impacts of human disturbance during wintering/migration. I want to give this topic the necessary attention and if the impacts need to be re-evaluated, then that's what needs to happen.

~Doug

Doug Wetmore
Environmental Planner

0025211

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

The Louis Berger Group, Inc. | 12596 West Bayaud Ave | Suite 201 | Lakewood, CO 80228 |
www.louisberger.com

This message, including any attachments hereto, may contain privileged and/or confidential information and is intended solely for the attention and use of the intended addressee(s). If you are not the intended addressee, you may neither use, copy, nor deliver to anyone this message or any of its attachments. In such case, you should immediately destroy this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply mail. Unless made by a person with actual authority conferred by The Louis Berger Group, Inc., (Berger) the information and statements herein do not constitute a binding commitment or warranty by Berger. Berger assumes no responsibility for any misperceptions, errors or misunderstandings. You are urged to verify any information that is confusing and report any errors/concerns to us in writing.

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

From: Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov [mailto:Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2009 4:16 PM
To: Mike_Murray@nps.gov
Cc: Wetmore, Doug; Fox, Lori
Subject: other wildlife - birds

Hi Mike,

Doug and I just discussed why the impacts on the other non-breeding shorebird species are less than they are for REKN. Doug and Richard had discussed it previously. The primary reasons are 1) the REKN population is declining precipitously (to the point i recall that one model predicted extinction in 5 years if steps were not taken to protect their primary food resource at Delaware Bay), whereas the other species' populations are in less decline and therefore of less concern during the life of the plan, and 2) the other species do not have the same energetic (caloric) needs that the REKN do because their migrations are shorter and they can therefore tolerate more disturbance than the REKN.

The first reason is mentioned briefly in the analysis, but could be elaborated on. The second will need to be included in the discussion or assumptions. Doug is looking at it and will provide language to clarify the rationale for the difference in impacts between the other non-breeding shorebirds and REKN. I will give the two sections another look as well.

Thanks for bringing this up. We need to explain more clearly why the impacts are different, since as you pointed out the REKN and the other non-breeding shorebirds use the same areas and the level of disturbance would likely be the same.

Sandy

Sandy Hamilton
Environmental Protection Specialist
National Park Service - Environmental Quality Division Academy Place P.O. Box 25287 Denver CO
80225
PH: (303) 969-2068
FAX: (303) 987-6782