

**From:** [Mike Murray](mailto:Mike.Murray)  
**To:** [Ackleybc@aol.com](mailto:Ackleybc@aol.com)  
**Cc:** [davisrb@embarqmail.com](mailto:davisrb@embarqmail.com); [hardhead@embarqmail.com](mailto:hardhead@embarqmail.com); [ccboucher@cox.net](mailto:ccboucher@cox.net); [warren@darenc.com](mailto:warren@darenc.com); [pfield@cbuilding.org](mailto:pfield@cbuilding.org); [rcf@fisherics.com](mailto:rcf@fisherics.com)  
**Bcc:** [Cyndy Holda](mailto:Cyndy.Holda); [Sandra Hamilton](mailto:Sandra.Hamilton); [mike.stevens@sol.doi.gov](mailto:mike.stevens@sol.doi.gov); [jason.waanders@sol.doi.gov](mailto:jason.waanders@sol.doi.gov)  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: (no subject)  
**Date:** 11/25/2008 10:52 AM

---

Hi Bob,

Thank you for your comments. I respect your right to interpret the NPS Organic Act and CAHA enabling legislation in your own way; however, the DOI Office of the Solicitor and NPS disagree with many of your opinions that are contrary to official agency policy and legal precedent. "Conservation is to be predominant" and "This is how courts have consistently interpreted the Organic Act" are factual statements taken directly from NPS Management Policies 2006 (section 1.4.3). The Yellowstone case is simply the most recent example of how a court has interpreted the Organic Act. That case cites other cases. For more cases, try Googling "NPS Organic Act court ruling" (or any variation of that phrase).

Recreation is, in fact, an important part of the legislated purpose of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. However, there is no sound legal basis for your assertion that the recreational portion of the CAHA legislation exempts CAHA from the Organic Act or from requirements to protect park resources on the beach. After our many RegNeg meeting discussions about the legal mandates, including the requirements of the Executive Orders and NPS regulation, the Organic Act, and the enabling legislation, it is surprising that you continue to suggest there is any legal basis for doing so. Though you may disagree, NPS must develop an ORV plan that meets the legal requirements for resource protection.

With regard to the slide show, it was simply an informative presentation to be used or not used as the Committee sees fit. The pie charts were intended to show the relative affect of various CAHA ORV management alternatives on the beaches to be affected by the ORV management plan, which, in fact, does not include Pea Island NWR. As a reminder, the Groundrules for the regulatory negotiation committee state:

Management of ORV use at Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge (PINWR) will not be included in the negotiated rulemaking process, as the Refuge is under exclusive administration of the USFWS rather than NPS and under a different set of laws and regulations [16 USC § 668dd(a)(1)]. *(Plus the following footnote)* The Committee acknowledges that for a number of years ORVs were allowed on PINWR, however those miles have been lost to ORV use. While management of that area is outside the scope of the plan/EIS and regulatory negotiation, the Committee takes official notice of this reduction in the original area open for access by ORV. The Committee also notes that the USFWS has prohibited off-road driving within the Refuge since the mid-1970's.

Thank you for your ongoing interest and participation in the negotiated rulemaking process!

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.

-----Ackleybc@aol.com wrote: -----

To: mike\_murray@nps.gov  
From: Ackleybc@aol.com  
Date: 11/21/2008 12:17PM  
cc: davisrb@embarqmail.com, hardhead@embarqmail.com, ccboucher@cox.net, warren@darenc.com  
Subject: Fwd: (no subject)