

0076088

From: [Ona Ferguson](mailto:Ona.Ferguson@nps.gov)
To: [Mike Murray@nps.gov](mailto:Mike.Murray@nps.gov)
Subject: Re: Your input (meeting summary)
Date: 12/05/2008 04:58 PM

Mike,

Thanks for the clarification.

I didn't get anything in your email but plain text, so I lifted what I got from you and put it into my document. If there was other text in your version that was included but had redline strikeout, I'm afraid I need it again in another format as I may have not seen the strikeout.

Sorry - I should have sent this along as a word attachment and avoided the complexity of pasting into email.

Ona

On 12/5/08 3:58 pm, "Mike_Murray@nps.gov" <Mike_Murray@nps.gov> wrote:

> Correct. I meant that the order of the words should be "interim strategy
> and consent decree" (opposite of what you had). I thought I had put a
> strike-out through some of the words in your version, but maybe it didn't
> carry through in the message.

>
>
> 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.

>
>
>
> Ona Ferguson
> <oferguson@cbuilding.org>
>
> 12/05/2008 01:35 PM
>
>
> Mike Murray <Mike_Murray@nps.gov>, To
> Cyndy Holda <Cyndy_Holda@nps.gov> cc
>
> Subject
> FW: Your input (meeting summary)

> Mike,

> A quick question for you: Under the section from the notes that you sent
> on
> "NPS ORV Management Alternatives," first paragraph, there's a sentence with
> a confused parenthetical. It reads:

> "NPS staff worked to develop a full range of reasonable alternatives for
> consideration during the evaluation, including two 'no action' alternatives
> (representing the consent decree interim strategy and the interim strategy
> consent decree) and three 'action' alternatives for the NEPA Draft
> Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)."

> I assume that a typo and that it is correct if we use "(representing
> interim
> strategy and the consent decree)", yes?

> Thanks,

> Ona

> ----- Forwarded Message
> From: Ona Ferguson <oferguson@cbuilding.org>
> Date: Fri, 05 Dec 2008 13:09:38 -0500
> To: <Mike_Murray@nps.gov>
> Conversation: Your input
> Subject: Re: Your input

> Thanks Mike.

> Ona

>

0076089

```
> On 12/3/08 5:02 pm, "Mike_Murray@nps.gov" <Mike_Murray@nps.gov> wrote:
>
>> Ona,
>>
>> See edits in RED.
>>
>> 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.
>>
>>
>>
>>          Ona Ferguson
>>          <oferguson@cbuild
>>          ing.org>
> To
>>
>>          12/02/2008 05:10           "Mike_Murray@nps.gov"
>>          PM                        <Mike_Murray@nps.gov>
> cc
>>
>>          Sandy Hamilton
>>          <Sandra_Hamilton@nps.gov>, Cyndy
>>          Holda <Cyndy_Holda@nps.gov>,
> Robert
>>
>>          Fisher <rcf@fisherics.com>
> Subject
>>
>>          Your input
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Mike,
>>
>> Please let me know in the next few days if there are any factual
>> corrections I need to make to the following segments of the November
>> meeting summary so they are accurate.
>>
>> Thanks,
>>
>> Ona
>>
>>
>> SEA TURTLES (Note, this is only the segment of the sea turtle
> presentation
>> and discussion in which NPS staff presented):
>>
>> "Michelle Baker, CAHA staff member, shared information about turtle and
>> turtle management on CAHA. Resource managers at CAHA relocate 10-20% of
>> turtle nests a year. In 2008, 22 nests were relocated (19.6%). Current
>> management between May 1-September 15 includes a daily survey of turtles
> by
>> staff technicians. If a nest containing eggs is found, the technician
>> erects a small closure. Filter fencing is installed to mitigate the
> effect
>> of lights on nestlings, and it is extended down to the water on Day 50.
>> When relocating nests, resource managers follow NCMWRC guidelines. There
>> was no statistical difference this year between success of relocated
> versus
>> non-relocated nests because of the power of fall storms. Every year CAHA
>> managers document incidents that count as take, including lighting and
>> harassment (examples include turtles stuck in footprints or vehicle
> tracks,
>> nests getting run over, and turtles ending up in parking lots). One
>> management goal is to achieve at least a 1:1 nest to false crawl ratio.
> In
>> 2008, CAHA attained this (112:103), but in 2007 it did not (82:114).
> False
>> crawl numbers are difficult to capture accurately. These numbers are
>> published in the CAHA annual report."
>>
>>
>>
>> NPS ORV Management Alternatives
>>
>> Mike Murray presented the ORV alternatives developed by NPS to meet NEPA
>> requirements and help the Park to meet its many legal and regulatory
>> requirements. NPS staff worked to develop a full range of reasonable
>> alternatives for consideration during the evaluation, including two 'no
>> action' alternatives (representing the consent decree interim strategy
> and
>> the interim strategy consent decree) and three 'action' alternatives for
>> the NEPA Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The action
>> alternatives were developed building on internal NPS and public scoping,
```

> as
 >> well as on the workbooks submitted by members of the public, and previous
 >> committee and subcommittee discussions. NPS is currently completing
 > working
 >> on the impact analysis of the alternatives, considering impacts on
 >> wildlife, geographic features, visitor experience, socioeconomic
 >> indicators, and NPS staffing requirements. The alternatives documents
 > can
 >> be found at:
 >>
 > <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=358&projectId=10641&documentID>
 >
 >> =25051
 >>
 >>
 >> The alternatives were shared with the Committee to provide information to
 >> the Committee to consider in developing their management alternative not
 > to
 >> limit what the Committee develops in any way. The hope is that the
 >> Committee will develop a consensus alternative that will become a fourth
 >> action alternative to be evaluated in the DEIS. When the Committee
 > reaches
 >> preliminary consensus, a preliminary NEPA impact analysis will be
 > prepared
 >> and shared with the Committee. Based on that analysis, the Committee
 > will
 >> be able to adjust the preliminary consensus option before making its
 > final
 >> recommendation.
 >>
 >> The NPS Draft EIS (DEIS) will be released for public comment in fall
 > 2009.
 >> The Record of Decision must be final by the end of 2010, and the final
 > rule
 >> must be promulgated by April 1, 2011.
 >>
 >> Committee members asked the following questions and made the following
 >> comments about the alternatives. Answers from the DFO are in italics.
 >>
 >> . Please include Pea Island data and data on areas open but not
 >> accessible to ORVs in presentation and/or pie charts. The ORV
 > management
 >> plan does not apply to Pea Island NWR, so the mileages shown as being
 >> affected by the various NPS ORV management alternatives do not include
 > the
 >> Refuge miles. NPS will revise the slides to clarify that Refuge miles
 > are
 >> not included in the pie charts and to identify the miles under the
 > Consent
 >> Decree that were theoretically "open," but were sandwiched between two
 >> resource closures with no practical way to get to the "open" area.
 > (Note:
 >> The relatively inaccessible miles had been included under "Seasonal
 > Closed
 >> to ORV" in the Alternative B mileage pie chart on Slide 25.)
 >> . What does a full-time biological employee cost? Estimated cost is
 >> \$35-50K/year. (Actual cost, confirmed after the meeting, is \$45,000 -
 >> \$55,000/year for a permanent full-time bio-tech position.) Implementing
 >> some of these alternatives effectively would require more three-season or
 >> year-round staff on CAHA. NPS does not yet have the funding to support
 > the
 >> 12.0-15.0 FTE staff estimated to be needed on Alternatives C, D and E.
 >> . Should the Committee focus on staffing and resources? No, please
 > focus
 >> on developing a consensus alternative you think would work.
 >> . What levels of enforcement staffing would these alternatives require?
 >> NPS is developing this information, and will share it in the DEIS if not
 >> before.
 >> . What are the light red lines on the land side of other colored lines
 > on
 >> the alternatives maps? Safety closures.
 >> . For Alternative C, would ORV routes be designated then closed
 >> seasonally? Yes, or ORV routes would be designated on a seasonal basis.
 > In
 >> other words, an area could be designated non-ORV during the summer and
 > open
 >> to ORVs in the off-season.
 >> . Are there provisions for adaptive management in the alternatives?
 > Yes,
 >> but the details need to be developed. NPS wants to do periodic review to
 >> the extent possible.
 >> . Do these alternatives consider the predicted population increase in
 > NC
 >> of 25% in the next decade? They consider the need for multiple access
 >> options and many other factors, but not that particular statistical
 >> prediction.
 >> . Would revenue from ORV permits pay for all CAHA staffing needs?
 >> Revenue from permits can only be used to administer an ORV plan.
 >> . Do the pie charts guarantee X% as the maximum ORV closures?
 > Year-round
 >> ORV routes are unlikely to have conflicts. Pie charts represent
 > designated
 >> areas, but overlay closures are always possible.
 >> . If there are permits and a seasonal carrying capacity is set, could
 > you
 >> pay for a permit then not be allowed onto the beach? There would not be
 > a
 >> guarantee that every permittee can get to every part of the beach all the
 >> time. However, it is likely that limits would be reached only for a few
 >> hours on a few holidays.
 >> . Is NPS considering opening the north end of Ocracoke (i.e., the

> narrow
>> beach that has been a safety closure for many years)? It is possible
> that
>> area could be opened, with based on the safety closure(delete "s")
>> procedures described as defined in each alternative.
>>
>> Committee members gave feedback to NPS on the three alternatives in small
>> groups. The facilitators summarized committee small group feedback in a
>> presentation to the Committee and the public. The presentation is
>> available at
>>
> <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=358&projectId=10641&documentID>
>
>> =25083
>
> ----- End of Forwarded Message
>
>
>
>