

0025223


Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS

12/18/2009 03:03 PM

To Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov

cc

bcc

Subject RE: CAHA chapter 4 (Part I) 

Sandy,

I'm sending this just to you to consider before forwarding to LB. I've reviewed this quickly and have only minor edits (mostly mis-spaced punctuation and removal of extra spaces between words) See attached.

**HOWEVER**, in reviewing the sections on "Other Bird Species" I was surprised that the level of impacts for A and B were fairly minimal and the same as for E and F, so I asked myself, what "other bird species" are we talking about. As described in Chapter 3 the other bird species are other migratory shorebirds, which makes me think that all of the impacts levels are wrong in Chapter 4.

What is currently described in Chapter 4 Part 1 makes sense ONLY if we are talking about birds that are not on the beach (i.e., marsh birds, uplands birds, etc.) but Chapter 3 identifies "other birds" that are primarily nonbreeding migratory shorebirds (e.g., other than Red Knots), the impacts for each alternative should be pretty much the same as for Red Knots, which is more adverse than what is currently described for "other birds" in Chapter 4.

In any case, I've realized (belatedly, I guess) that the impact descriptions in Chapter 4 for "other birds" is **ALL WRONG** as currently written and need to be fixed. Britta is on leave through the holidays and I will have limited ability to review it further. Hopefully, you can talk to Lori and they can fix it. I can live with it as long as the reasoning and impact levels are structured similarly to what is stated in Chapter 4 for Red Knots. (Personally, I think the reasoning and impacts are exactly the same for Red Knots as for "other" nonbreeding migratory shorebird species.)

Have not gotten to Chapter 4 Part III yet. Will try to take a quick look at it and send you some comments this weekend, if I can (or next week if I can borrow a computer where I am going).



Chapter 4\_121809 Part I of III.mbm edits.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.

"Wetmore, Doug" <dwetmore@louisberger.com>




"Wetmore, Doug".  
<dwetmore@louisberger.com

To <Mike\_Murray@nps.gov>, <Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov>

0025224

Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS  
12/18/2009 03:47 PM

To "Wetmore, Doug" <dwetmore@louisberger.com>  
cc "Fox, Lori" <lfox@louisberger.com>, Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov  
bcc  
Subject RE: CAHA chapter 4 - Part II (of 3) 

Doug,

I'm not sure where you mean (page #, etc.). I made a number of edits, mostly minor, but cannot easily list them.

With regard to "negligible" related to REKN, there are two instances where I've made comments that reoccur across different alternatives.

1) There are a few old comments in which I commented about inserting "negligible" in front of "benefits" to REKN from PIPL nonbreeding closures (suitable interior habitats, etc.) under A and B, but your current wording (below) fixed that and is good as is since it puts the "benefits" to REKN of PIPL nonbreeding closures in context. It looks like the date changed on some of these old comments (don't know why), but the current wording is on this issue is fine and those comments can be considered resolved).

Impacts to non-breeding red knot would be long-term minor adverse as their prime foraging habitat (ocean shoreline) would not be afforded protection by non-breeding closures, although the ability of this species to use wintering closures for piping plover at inlets and Cape Point would result in some benefit.

2) The second issue in which i made edits related to "negligible" is that I tried to fix inconsistencies in the impacts of surveying on REKN. There was some inconsistent usage of "negligible" and "negligible adverse" (so I added "adverse" wherever it only said "negligible"). I did not have a problem with the impact level assigned, just in the inconsistent use of terminology. I can live with either "negligible" or "negligible adverse" in this context, as long as only one or the other is used consistently.

Hopefully, this clarifies it.

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.

"Wetmore, Doug" <dwetmore@louisberger.com>



"Wetmore, Doug"  
<dwetmore@louisberger.com>  
>  
12/18/2009 05:07 PM

To <Mike\_Murray@nps.gov>  
cc "Fox, Lori" <lfox@louisberger.com>, <Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov>



Subject RE: CAHA chapter 4 - Part II (of 3)

Mike.

I was only able to see that you made one comment (same comment in a couple places) which had to do with the beneficial impacts to red knot from wintering closures for PIPL. It looks like you wanted the word "negligible" to be inserted, as rekn prefer beach habitat which would be unprotected by PIPL wintering closures. However, modifiers for beneficial impacts are only used for Federal T&E species. How about I just use the term "minimal"?

Were those the only comments? Unfortunately, all of your comments came across with yesterday's date on them, so I can't tell what's new or what's old.

Please let me know if I've missed anything.

Thanks Mike.

Doug Wetmore  
Environmental Planner

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](http://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: Mike\_Murray@nps.gov [mailto:Mike\_Murray@nps.gov]  
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2009 1:16 PM  
To: Wetmore, Doug  
Cc: Fox, Lori; Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov  
Subject: Re: CAHA chapter 4 - Part II (of 3)  
Importance: High

Doug,

In my previous message about the State-listed / Special Status Species section of Chapter 4, I forgot to mention two general comments:

1) Need to correct "Cohen et al. 2009" throughout. I believe the latest

recommendation (which you may not have seen) is to use "Cohen et al. in press" since we do not know if it will be published in 2009 or 2010. Sandy, is that correct?

2) Need to decide whether it is spelled "non-breeding" or "nonbreeding" and be consistent throughout the entire document (not just Chapter 4), including in the Species Management Tables. In the State Listed / Special Status Species section of Chapter 4, under alternative D, Wintering section, second paragraph, is a good (actually bad) example of both spellings being used interchangeably and inconsistently within a short amount of sentences. Webster's New International Unabridged Dictionary, 1955 (the big one we have here at HQ) spells it "nonbreeding" without a hyphen, which is good enough for me (it would save a few hundred spaces in the document!). In any case, I did not attempt to fix this, but let's go with "nonbreeding" as the way to spell it and apply it throughout the DEIS.

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.

"Wetmore, Doug"  
<dwetmore@louisberger.com>

12/17/2009 10:46  
PM

<Mike\_Murray@nps.gov>,  
<Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov>

To

cc

"Fox, Lori" <lfox@louisberger.com>  
Subject  
CAHA chapter 4

Hi Mike.

I'm attaching Part II (Special Status Species in track changes) for your review. Parts I and III will follow on Friday morning. We've made good progress on most impact topics, but didn't want to send other parts until we've completed each of the sections within each part. I hope that makes sense. It's all in the interest of "version control", so we make sure that we have the most up to date edits.

0025227

If you're not interested in the "track changes" versions, I can start sending you individual sections for review, but I thought you would like to see the edits that were made since you last saw it.

Thanks, and please let me know if there are any questions or concerns.

~Doug

Doug Wetmore  
Environmental Planner

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](http://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.

[attachment "Chapter 4\_121709\_Part II of III (SpecStatus).doc" deleted by Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS]