



Thomas, Sue <sue_thomas@fws.gov>

Re: Dungeness-Skallam consultation briefing

1 message

McCarthy, Nicole <nicole_mccarthy@fws.gov>
To: "Thomas, Sue" <sue_thomas@fws.gov>

Mon, Apr 22, 2019 at 12:25 PM

Thank you. I did a little more reading and found that out. Thanks!

On Mon, Apr 22, 2019 at 12:07 PM Thomas, Sue <sue_thomas@fws.gov> wrote:

That is also referring to Humboldt Bay.

Sue

Sue Thomas
Wildlife Biologist
Washington Maritime NWRC
715 Holgerson Rd
Sequim, WA 98382
360-457-8451

On Mon, Apr 22, 2019 at 12:04 PM McCarthy, Nicole <nicole_mccarthy@fws.gov> wrote:

Hi, one more question about the bay aquaculture question. The document says

The majority of brant and eelgrass are located in the South Bay (Moore et al 2004) while all aquaculture was located in the northern portion of the bay.

Is this referring to Humboldt or Dungeness?

On Mon, Apr 22, 2019 at 11:09 AM Jennifer BrownScott <jennifer_brownscoth@fws.gov> wrote:

The Confluence Report was written by a contractor, not by the Tribe. The Tribe May be taking it at face value, and may not realize that some of these errors/misrepresentations exist.

-jennifer

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 22, 2019, at 2:03 PM, McCarthy, Nicole <nicole_mccarthy@fws.gov> wrote:

Yes. Still hard to understand why the tribe would make such a misleading or incorrect statement.

Thanks,
Nicole

On Mon, Apr 22, 2019 at 8:56 AM Thomas, Sue <sue_thomas@fws.gov> wrote:

Yes it is a contradiction. But I see some of the confusion. Stillman et al did not address aquaculture in Humboldt Bay let alone Dungeness. They are misrepresenting the paper and that is the main point - there are many of these types of misrepresentations in the Confluence report.

They rely heavily on the Confluence report to show that aquaculture would have no- to beneficial- impact on wildlife in Dungeness Bay based on these types of misrepresentations. The best way to say this might be:

The Confluence report states that “Stillman et al’s (2015) observations in Humboldt Bay suggest that even 300+ acres of aquaculture activity may be having minimal or no impact on Brant” is misleading since Stillman et al did not address aquaculture in *Humboldt Bay*, and the majority of Brant and eelgrass are located in the South Bay (Moore et al 2004) while all aquaculture was located in the northern portion of the bay.

Does that clarify?

Sue

Sue Thomas
Wildlife Biologist
Washington Maritime NWRC
715 Holgerson Rd
Sequim, WA 98382
360-457-8451

On Mon, Apr 22, 2019 at 7:01 AM McCarthy, Nicole <nicole_mccarthy@fws.gov> wrote:

Hi Jennifer and Sue, here is my last question and then I think this is in good shape. It's about Stillman. First paragraph is from original document. Second paragraph is my adding that Stillman was not talking about Dungeness Bay. The last one is my question.

The Confluence report states that “Stillman et al’s (2015) observations in Humboldt Bay suggest that even 300+ acres of aquaculture activity may be having minimal or no impact on Brant” is misleading since Stillman et al did not address aquaculture, and the majority of Brant and eelgrass are located in the South Bay (Moore et al 2004) while all aquaculture was located in the northern portion of the bay.

ff

The Confluence report states that “Stillman et al’s (2015) observations in Humboldt Bay suggest that even 300+ acres of aquaculture activity may be having minimal or no impact on Brant” which is misleading since Stillman et al did not address aquaculture in Dungeness Bay^[BJ1]. The majority of brant and eelgrass are located in the South Bay (Moore et al 2004) while all aquaculture was located in the northern portion of the bay.

So if Stillman did not address aquaculture, why would the tribe say that he did? They say that he did address aquaculture (in Humboldt Bay) and that 300+ acres is fine. So, did the tribe misinterpret Stillman’s conclusions or misquote him? Because right now it’s a contradiction. One sentence says he did and one sentence says he didn’t. Perhaps a small point in the scheme of things, it’s just confusing for the reader.

Thank you!

^[BJ1]I am pretty sure that Stillman does not address aquaculture at all

On Mon, Apr 22, 2019 at 4:21 AM BrownScott, Jennifer <jennifer_brownscoott@fws.gov> wrote:

I did not see any yellow highlights in the document. I have tried to respond to any comments that did not have any answers associated with them and have highlighted those answers in yellow. Please let me know if I missed anything. I will most likely be available to talk after 2pm your time today if needed.

My cell number is (360) 460-5407.

-jennifer

Jennifer Brown-Scott
Refuge Manager
Washington Maritime NWRC
715 Holgerson Rd
Sequim, WA 98382
office: (360) 457-8451 ext.22
fax: (360) 457-9778

*~~Dungeness NWR~Protection Island NWR~San Juan Islands NWR~~
~~Copalis NWR~Flattery Rocks NWR~Quillayute Needles NWR~~*

On Thu, Apr 18, 2019 at 8:38 AM McCarthy, Nicole <nicole_mccarthy@fws.gov> wrote:

Hi Jennifer and Sue,

Take a look and see what you think. I can change anything if you like. This is such a solid document, you did such a nice job with a good tone.

Thank you,
Nicole

--

Nicole McCarthy
Technical Writer/Editor, Conservation Planning
National Wildlife Refuge System
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Region 1, Portland, Oregon
503-872-2704

--

Nicole McCarthy
Technical Writer/Editor, Conservation Planning
National Wildlife Refuge System
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Region 1, Portland, Oregon
503-872-2704

--

Nicole McCarthy
Technical Writer/Editor, Conservation Planning
National Wildlife Refuge System
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Region 1, Portland, Oregon

503-872-2704

--

Nicole McCarthy
Technical Writer/Editor, Conservation Planning
National Wildlife Refuge System
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Region 1, Portland, Oregon
503-872-2704

--

Nicole McCarthy
Technical Writer/Editor, Conservation Planning
National Wildlife Refuge System
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Region 1, Portland, Oregon
503-872-2704