

From: [Myers, Gordon S.](mailto:Myers_Gordon_S)
To: [Allen, David H.](mailto:Allen_David_H); [Mike Murray@nps.gov](mailto:Mike_Murray@nps.gov); pete_benjamin@fws.gov
Cc: pfield@cbuilding.org; rcf@fisherccs.com
Subject: RE: request for assistance
Date: 02/18/2009 06:20 PM

David,
The plan you have outlined sounds good.

Thanks,
Gordon

Gordon Myers
Executive Director
North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission
1701 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1701
Ph: 919.707.0151
Fax: 919.707.0020
gordon.myers@ncwildlife.org
www.ncwildlife.org

-----Original Message-----

From: David Allen [<mailto:allend@coastalnet.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 18, 2009 6:09 PM
To: [Mike Murray@nps.gov](mailto:Mike_Murray@nps.gov); pete_benjamin@fws.gov
Cc: Myers, Gordon S.; pfield@cbuilding.org; rcf@fisherccs.com
Subject: RE: request for assistance

I will try to outline something tonight that NCWRC can support, and send it to both Gordon (since I'll want his concurrence) and to Pete and David R. I get the feeling that FWS will pretty much agree with our recommendation as long as it has some adaptive management and goals incorporated. But since they are the experts in those fields, I'll let them add those concepts. I have another meeting all day tomorrow, so hopefully Gordon will have a chance to look it over, and the FWS will have a chance to incorporate any aspects they want, and we can finalize something by Friday afternoon or Monday AM.

> [Original Message]

> From: <Mike_Murray@nps.gov>
> To: <pete_benjamin@fws.gov>; <allend@coastalnet.com>
> Cc: <gordon.myers@ncwildlife.org>; <pfield@cbuilding.org>;
<rcf@fisherccs.com>
> Date: 2/18/2009 5:04:28 PM
> Subject: request for assistance

> Pete and Dave,

> I appreciated your participation in the integration group discussion on Monday. After five days of negotiations, the group has a working proposal with a number of differences that still need to be resolved. One of the unresolved issues is night driving. There was a significant difference between what the environmental stakeholders propose (night driving prohibited May 1 - Nov 15, from 1 hour after sunset until beaches have been patrolled in the morning; park and stay allowed as previously described) and what the ORV/access stakeholders want (night driving prohibited from the Tuesday after Memorial weekend until the Friday before Labor Day weekend, from 1 hour after sunset until beaches have been patrolled in the morning, or preferably a fixed time; park and stay allowed as previously described).

> As a means of resolving the differences on this issue, I proposed to the group that we ask FWS and WRC to make a joint recommendation for night driving that both agencies could heartily support. (This is what I will do anyway if the group or the Committee cannot agree, so I figure why not do it now and let the group consider accepting it?) There was interest in this approach. My thinking is that your proposal would likely be more flexible than the environmental proposal and more protective (and defensible) than the access proposal. My hope is that you could help identify a biologically defensible, adequately protective approach that could allow for some selective relaxation in the future if results warrant it (e.g., selective relaxation in the future might be a change in dates, or allowing select routes to inlets or Cape Point to have more flexibility than other locations during either the Spring and/or the fall).

> Pete, people were particularly intrigued by your discussion of examples at Ft. Bragg and Camp Lejeune that allowed for eventual relaxation of restrictions as performance objectives were met. Is it possible for you to define something like that for night driving at CAHA? For example, if you believe that a night lighting ordinance would be beneficial, perhaps you could consider a phased relaxation of access restrictions once an ordinance goes into effect or when some nesting target is met.
> Bottom line: Would you two (or your designated staff) please work together to develop a concise straightforward proposal for managing night driving

> that both of your agencies could heartily support. Ideally, it would be
> more concise and easier to understand and implement than the latest NR
> subcommittee proposal (which is attached as background information). You
> should consider all the previous discussion that went into that proposal,
> but I suspect it would be better to start from scratch in writing a new
> recommendation rather than try to edit the existing document (it is too
> long and complicated). I don't think you need to provide a lengthy
> explanation or justification; just propose the concise measures (i.e.,
> bullets) that both of you can support. Hopefully, one page or less, if
> possible. You can assume that NPS monitoring and nest management would
> occur as described in the Resource Protection Tables, unless you specify
> something different or additional in your proposal. Please make one joint
> recommendation that may involve multiple elements. We do NOT need multiple
> options to choose from (such as if NPS does this, that, and the other,
> then
> we can allow that; but if we only do this and that, then we can only allow
> something else). Please pick the combination of measures that you
> recommend. We need ONE proposal that you both can agree to support. This
> is your chance to recommend what you really think it should be to protect
> turtles and provide for a legally and biologically defensible plan. That
> is what I am asking for.
>
> Thank you for your consideration of this request and for your ongoing
> assistance. It would be most helpful if you could provide a joint
> recommendation to the facilitators and me by Monday morning, as we have an
> integration group conference call Monday afternoon and will want to share
> the information before the call. Please feel free to call if you have any
> questions.
>
> Thanks again for your efforts.
>
> (See attached file: NightTurtleProtection&Access2-6.doc)
> 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.