

0027716

From: [Mike Murray](#)
To: [Sandra Hamilton](#); [Darrell Echols](#); [Thayer Broili](#)
Cc: [Doug Wetmore](#)
Subject: Re: alt F - 35 m corridor
Date: 08/05/2010 04:09 PM

Based on our experience with the interim strategy and consent decree (which have 100 ft corridors that tend to widen as the season progresses due to accretion) and comments on the DEIS (some of the envi groups recommended 100 ft corridors at Cape Pt and South Pt), an initial breeding season corridor closer to 100 ft than 150 ft seems better for resources, more in keeping with recent nesting patterns, and less likely than 150 ft to need as many modifications after the pre-nesting area is established. Since the beach generally accretes at these location as the season progresses, it is likely that the corridor will widen a bit. We went with 35 meters (instead of 100 ft) in order to utilize a metric based whole number (multiple of 5 or 10) that is a little more than 100 ft at the start of the season and not as likely (as 150 ft corridor) to be greater than 150 ft wide as the season progresses).

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
▼ [Sandra Hamilton](#)

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

From: Sandra Hamilton
Sent: 08/05/2010 07:06 AM MDT
To: Mike Murray; Darrell Echols; Thayer Broili
Cc: Doug Wetmore
Subject: alt F - 35 m corridor

When you have a chance, would you please send us the rationale for the 35 m (115 ft) [versus some other width] corridor at Cape Point and South Point during the breeding season as stated in the revised alt F. i.e. Why 35 m rather than the "generally no more than 50 meters wide" as stated in the DEIS? We need it for the admin record and also for response to comment. Thanks.

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