

0029245

**From:** [Fox, Lori](#)  
**To:** [Herron, Amanda](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CWB DFCs and nest counts  
**Date:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 10:19:37 AM  
**Attachments:** [20100922\\_email\\_Allen\\_to\\_Muiznieks-RE\\_CWB\\_nest\\_totals.pdf](#)  
[CWB DFCs.rev100610.docx](#)

---

Please make sure this is in the caha admin, thanks!

Lori Fox  
Deputy Director, Denver Operations/Senior Planner

Direct 303-985-6602  
Main 303-985-6600  
Mobile 301-461-8772  
Fax 303-984-4942

The Louis Berger Group, Inc. | 535 16th Street | Suite 600 | Denver, CO 80202 | [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: Sandra\_Hamilton@nps.gov [[mailto:Sandra\\_Hamilton@nps.gov](mailto:Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov)]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2010 1:52 PM  
To: Fox, Lori; Mike\_Murray@nps.gov; Doug\_McGee@nps.gov  
Subject: Fw: CWB DFCs and nest counts

The data I'm recalling about the BLSK numbers is in Britta's email attached below to David Allen.

I think it's appropriate to footnote also for the BLSK number that the 5 is an underestimate since 10 were observed later in the season, and that forecasting the peak is challenging. We can cite Britta's email to David.

If there's a better way to word this, let me know. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS on 10/12/2010 01:47 PM -----

Mike  
Murray/CAHA/NPS

10/06/2010 02:57  
PM

To  
Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS@NPS  
cc  
Doug Wetmore/DENVER/NPS@NPS  
Subject  
CWB DFCs and nest counts

Sandy,

As background, see message below.

I'll make edits in 2nd draft of Chapter 1 to revise DFCs for CWB as described in the file below. I do not intend to include the "calculations" piece in Chapter 1 unless you think it should be included, but attach it now as background for how the numbers were derived. I believe this approach is responsive to the SELC comments that the DEIS CWB DFCs were based on historical low nest totals from 2007-2008. I'm not sure if the revised DFCs will mean we need to revise the response to that particular comment (I don't remember how specific we were in saying it would be revised: did we say it would be revised, in general, based on longer term data, or did we say it would be revised in a specific way with specific new target numbers?), so someone should check it to see if the response needs to be revised or not.

Also, see Britta's comment about the 2010 CWB nest counts, which may be an underestimation per David Allen's email (attached). Would someone at EQD or LB decide where this should be mentioned in the FEIS. My thought would be to include it once as a footnote for Table 30 on page 255, then cite and add David's email as a reference; then not add the explanation anywhere/everywhere the else that the 2010 counts are mentioned in text. I don't fully understand all the procedural requirements of editing, citing references, etc. so someone besides me should decide how to handle it.

Will send Chapter 1 comments, with revised CWB DFCs, soon.

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.

----- Forwarded by Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS on 10/06/2010 04:43 PM -----

Britta  
Muiznieks/CAHA/NP  
S  
10/06/2010 03:53  
PM  
To  
Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS@NPS  
cc  
Subject  
Re: try again(Document link: Mike  
Murray)

0029247

Let's go with this version.

FYI. I'm not sure if you ever saw David Allen's response on how to handle chicks when conducting nest counts. If you only use the nests from our counts and ignore the chicks, we know it is an underestimate of the actual number of nests. It might be worth mentioning that our totals are underestimates if we are including the 2010 totals for CWBs elsewhere in the EIS. (See attached file: 20100922 email Allen to Muiznieks-RE\_ CWB nest totals.pdf)

Britta Muiznieks  
Wildlife Biologist  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore

252-995-3740-Office  
252-475-8348-Cell  
252-995-6998-FAX

Mike  
Murray/CAHA/NPS

10/06/2010 03:13  
PM

To  
Britta Muiznieks/CAHA/NPS@NPS  
cc

Subject

try again

See message below. Consider, along with this attachment.

(See attached file: CWB DFCs.rev100610.docx)

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.

----- Forwarded by Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS on 10/06/2010 03:11 PM -----

Mike  
Murray/CAHA/NPS

10/06/2010 02:44  
PM

To  
Britta Muiznieks/CAHA/NPS  
cc

Subject  
one last try at CWB DFCs

Britta,

In looking at the numbers, I came up with another approach for CWB DFCs that seems to provide reasonably ambitious short- and long-term targets that are more realistic (at least for COTEs) than Tim's approach. See attached.

In general, the long-term target would be the "long-term average" number of nests that occurred for the period of 1977-2004 before the recent "historic low" nest counts occurred. The short-term target would be based on the mid-point between the "recent average" for the historic low period of 2007-2010 and the "long-term average" from 1977-2004. All data used is from Table 30 in the FEIS. I think this approach would be responsive to the comments/concerns that the DEIS DFCs for CWB were based only on the recent, historically low numbers. This new approach seems a little more logical to me. Does this approach make sense (as much as any of the approaches do)? Can you live with this?

[attachment "CWB DFCs.rev100610.docx" deleted by Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS]

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.