

#3010



Sherri Fields /Atlanta/NPS
09/12/2008 12:50 PM EDT

To Mike_Murray@nps.gov
cc Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS@NPS,
Thayer_Broili@nps.gov, Timothy_Pinion@nps.gov,
cherry_green@nps.gov
bcc
Subject Fw: review of CAHA Cape Point suggestions

Mike-
See Tim's feedback in the attachment with his email. Let us know if you need something more.

Sherri

Sherri L. Fields, Chief
Science & Natural Resources Division
Southeast Regional Office
National Park Service
(404) 562-3113, ext 517

----- Forwarded by Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS on 09/12/2008 12:49 PM -----



Timothy Pinion /Atlanta/NPS
09/12/2008 11:06 AM

To Sherri_Fields@nps.gov
cc Cherry Green/Atlanta/NPS@NPS
Subject review of CAHA Cape Point suggestions

Hi, Sherri.

As requested, here are a few thoughts on the document described below.

--Tim



NegReg_Cape Point Nat Res 9-3-08_comments.doc

Tim Pinion
Wildlife Biologist and T & E Coordinator
National Park Service, Southeast Region
100 Alabama St., SW. 1924 Bldg.
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-562-3113 ext 512
Timothy_Pinion@nps.gov

Cherry Green/Atlanta/NPS



Cherry Green /Atlanta/NPS
09/11/2008 06:52 AM

To Timothy Pinion/Atlanta/NPS@NPS
cc
Subject Fw: Natural Resources

Comments regarding: CAHA Off-Road Driving Regulatory Negotiation Natural Resources and Cape Point Working Document draft 9/4/08

FROM PAGE 2

Pre-Nesting Closures

• *Follow the configuration of the 2008 pre-nesting closures for Cape Point and South Beach, except increase the width of the Cape Point access corridor (on the east facing beach) to a greater distance (the distance is currently some 33 m – suggestions for increase include 100 m or other distances to be determined), from Ramp 44 south to the Point. This would expand the initial width of the Cape Point access corridor, seek to only marginally decrease pre-nesting habitat, and reduce the likelihood of subsequent full closure of the access corridor due to CWBs as the breeding season progresses.*

If the objective is to provide access to the point, why is there a need to increase the corridor width from 33m to 100m? It is not clear how increasing the corridor 3-fold will allow more access. A map of 2008 pre-nesting closures with various corridor widths would allow an evaluation of how much the potential habitat is decreased.

It is also unclear how the increased corridor would reduce the likelihood of subsequent closures for CWB. Is this because CWB would be less likely to nest in the area due to increased dispersal of vehicles?

• *OR, because of dynamic changes on the beach over time, rather than fixing the prenesting closures to a particular year, consider an annual habitat assessment guide by clear, specific criteria for predictability and certainty of administration to identify each year suitable, sufficient, and appropriate pre-nesting closures*

It might be more difficult to identify areas that are suitable, sufficient, and appropriate than it would be to assess areas that are inappropriate or unsuitable (due to vegetation encroachment, for example). Pre-season assessments seem like a good idea considering the dynamic ecosystem, but rather than starting with a clean slate each year, pre-nesting closures should be based on past bird activity, except where assessments show that the area is clearly unsuitable.

Provide reduced buffer distances (TBD) along the Cape Point access corridor from Ramp 44 to Cape Point for observed non-listed species (all but Piping Plover) breeding or prenesting behavior up until scrapes/nests are on the ground.

Buffer distances should be tied to a bird's behavior rather than its status as federally listed. Also, consider from NPS Management Policies 2006, Section 4.4.2.3: "The National Park Service will inventory, monitor, and manage state and locally listed species in a manner similar to its treatment of federally listed

species to the greatest extent possible.” It might also be instructive for the FWS to describe to the committee the protections afforded to species like AMOY under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

The concept of adaptively managing buffer distances for birds sounds like a good one, as long as we err on the side of protection for the birds when there is doubt. Will it be possible to have sufficient NPS observers on-site to monitor bird response?

PAGE 3

Active Management Tools to Enhance CWB Nesting (with the intent of encouraging nesting further away from the Access Corridor to preserve access on the east beach)

We should keep in mind this information from NPS Management Policies, Section 4.4.2: “Whenever possible, natural processes will be relied upon to maintain native plant and animal species and influence natural fluctuations in populations of these species. The Service may intervene to manage individuals or populations of native species only when such intervention will not cause unacceptable impacts to the populations of the species or to other components and processes of the ecosystems that support them.” It would seem that proposed deterrents, such as chick fencing or avian predator decoys, have the potential to cause unacceptable impacts to the species by reducing their ability to access potential nesting, foraging, or sheltering areas.

Several suggestions on page 3 and 4 would require the NPS to provide “sufficient on-site monitoring.” This raises the question, will it be possible to have sufficient NPS observers on-site to monitor bird response?

Improvement of CWB nesting substrate (shell, cobble, etc.), if feasible.

Sounds like an interesting approach if we can show that suitable substrate is a limiting factor for CWB nesting.

PAGE 6

After subcommittee review, vet proposal for both birds and turtles with resource experts (e.g., Erwin, Hecht, Simons, or others) for feedback and fine-tuning.

This would be an essential step in the process.



Tim,

Could you look over the attached **CAHA Off-Road Driving Regulatory Negotiation** developed as a part of the Reg Negotiations for the CAHA ORV Plan? Mike Murray wanted our comments by Friday, August 12 and apparently Sherri just discovered the request for review in her stack of e.mail messages from last week when she was on annual leave. Just let me know if you can provide any comments to Mike, and if you need until Monday Sept. 15 we can send Mike an e.mail asking for an extra day to review.

Thanks,

Cherry Green
Chief, Natural Resource Management
and Regional Wetlands Ecologist
National Park Service
100 Alabama St., S.W. 1924 Bldg.
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 562-3113 ext. 696
(770) 480-3245 cell

----- Forwarded by Cherry Green/Atlanta/NPS on 09/11/2008 06:48 AM -----



Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS

09/10/2008 04:26 PM

To cherry_green@nps.gov

cc

Subject Fw: Natural Resources



Cherry-

Could you please ask Tim to take a look at this and send me some comments back? Please note Mike was hoping for feedback by the end of this week. (I apologize for the short turn around but I'm still digging through emails from last week.)

Thanks,
Sherri

Sherri L. Fields, Chief
Science & Natural Resources Division
Southeast Regional Office
National Park Service
(404) 562-3113, ext 517

----- Forwarded by Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS on 09/10/2008 04:23 PM -----



Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS

09/05/2008 09:17 AM

To Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS@NPS

cc Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS@NPS, Thayer
Broili/CAHA/NPS@NPS

Subject Fw: Natural Resources

Hi Sherri,

Would you please have someone take a look at the attached Cape Point proposal and give us some feedback on it by the end of next week.

As background: The draft is for discussion purposes only (an effort to think out of the box and get people off their entrenched positions); and nobody including NPS has committed to it. David Rabon, Dave Allen, and Walker Golder, among others, are on the subcommittee. There are a few unconventional ideas in it (some put in there by me to generate discussion), including some of which may not jive well with NPS policy. Would appreciate comments about the appropriateness and potential effectiveness of such ideas. Some of the ideas for managing least terns (enhancing nesting substrate, chick fencing, use of decoys to attract terns to the enhanced nesting substrate, etc.) come from methods used on California least terns, a federally listed endangered population.

Thank you,

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 09/05/2008 08:03 AM -----



Cyndy Holda/CAHA/NPS

09/05/2008 07:16 AM

To

cc

Subject Fw: Natural Resources

To: Reg Neg Committee Members

From: CBI

Subject: Natural Resources document

Here's the natural resources piece to send to the committee. Hope all are holding up under the weather down there.

PAT

[attachment "NatResc9-4.pdf" deleted by Timothy Pinion/Atlanta/NPS]