

0026866

From: [Carol Beidleman](#)
To: [Sandra Hamilton](#)
Subject: Fw: CAHA comments
Date: 06/22/2010 02:19 PM
Attachments: [Comments on Cape Hatteras NS Draft Off.docx](#)

Hi Sandy,

Here are some comments from Greg Eckert re the CAHA plan/EIS and DFCs.

Carol

Carol Beidleman
Park Flight Migratory Bird Program Coordinator
Biological Resource Management Division
National Park Service
Carol_Beidleman@nps.gov

----- Forwarded by Carol Beidleman/FTCOLLINS/NPS on 06/22/2010 02:10 PM -----

**Greg
Eckert/FTCOLLINS/NPS** To Carol Beidleman/FTCOLLINS/NPS@NPS
cc
06/22/2010 11:15 AM Subject CAHA comments



Comments on Cape Hatteras NS Draft Off.docx

Gregory E. Eckert, PhD
Restoration Ecologist
National Park Service
Suite 200, 1201 Oakridge Drive
Fort Collins, CO 80521
970-225-3594 (voice)

From: [Carol Beidleman](#)
To: [Sandra Hamilton](#)
Subject: Fw: Preliminary response to CAHA DEIS questions
Date: 06/22/2010 02:22 PM

Hi Sandy,

Some additional preliminary comments from Greg, in response to the questions in your original email and before his further review of the plan/EIS and DFCs.

Carol

Carol Beidleman
Park Flight Migratory Bird Program Coordinator
Biological Resource Management Division
National Park Service
Carol_Beidleman@nps.gov

----- Forwarded by Carol Beidleman/FTCOLLINS/NPS on 06/22/2010 02:19 PM -----

Greg Eckert/FTCOLLINS/NPS To Carol Beidleman/FTCOLLINS/NPS@NPS
cc
06/10/2010 01:46 PM Subject Preliminary response to CAHA DEIS questions

CONFIDENTIAL DELIBERATIVE COMMUNICATION - NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

Carol,

There are a few questions being asked by EQD, and all speak to some conclusions based on a lot of background information. So here are a few thoughts to get us all moving forward perhaps:

When distinguishing between take of listed or non-listed species, we need to remember that we manage populations of different species, and communities of organisms, and we have preservation mandates for all resources.

In response to:

From the park perspective the bigger issue is not the specifics of which species or ramps are involved, but whether or not they are going to: 1) give absolute priority in all situations nesting shorebirds in ALL locations (i.e., any where / every where they demonstrate breeding behavior would be given the full buffer); or 2) can/will there be some locations (such as in front of the villages and day use beaches) where recreation is given the priority? The options were developed in the search for a systematic way of doing the latter.

I'll need to review the "options" but this is what the desired condition process - as a precursor to planning - is meant to do. Has the park developed desired conditions for populations of different birds, or at least some metrics for the number of shorebird

types, such as a ration of numbers of some species to others based on migrations and/or habitats?

Regarding the information on defining DFCs for Least terns and whether measrues should be based on one year of data or a period of 6 years, I would need to know if any othe rdata sets have been considered with these, such as reference habitat areas at Cape Lookout and other locations, such as TNC preserves in Virginia. Does the information used to propose DFCs include any models of carrying capacity within a habitat patch? Were data related to population size outside the park considered, such as weatehr events in other parts of the range?

Gregory E. Eckert, PhD
Restoration Ecologist
National Park Service
Suite 200, 1201 Oakridge Drive
Fort Collins, CO 80521
970-225-3594 (voice)

Comments on Cape Hatteras NS Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / EIS

Greg Eckert, NRPC-BRMD

June 22, 2010

Recommend that the document establish the following concepts early on:

Develop the relationship between “protect and preserve” to criteria for these in the form of DFCs

Establish the Seashore’s role in species protection to populations, and habitat conditions as tied to population metrics. I see a shift from the use of species to population but nothing that distinguishes the two for the reader.

I’d suggest establishing a hierarchical approach to natural resource objectives beginning with the shoreline ecosystem. This provides context and relationships among objectives for resources within the system. This also establishes the habitat basis for analysis, given out lack of control on other external factors influencing population numbers.

I would add desired conditions for habitat. That is what we manage. Begin with broad attributes of size, condition and landscape context. Then, management actions, including restrictions on ORVs can be linked to population targets.

Information on DFCs for birds seems to be limited. Is there not information available from reference sites and the literature to develop these numbers?

I would rework the introduction to Adaptive Resource Management (ARM)(p 74) and certainly the process must include “setting hypotheses using models and measurable objectives.”

You can use measurable objectives and DFCs to propose an adaptive management strategy for alternatives. The ARM process really is not presented here at all.