

From: keene9558
Reply To: jkeene@franklineq.com
To: Mike Murray@nps.gov
Cc: 'John Couch'; 'Larry Hardham'
Subject: RE:
Date: 03/30/2009 10:24 AM

Mike

Mike

Thank you for the reply. We can all recognize the shortcomings of the press and/or the readers and clarifications are most helpful when the telephone starts ringing.

Jim Keene

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Murray@nps.gov [mailto:Mike_Murray@nps.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2009 9:31 AM
To: jkeene@franklineq.com
Cc: 'John Couch'; 'Larry Hardham'
Subject: Re:

Jim,

Absolutely nothing has changed in terms of process or approach. The reporter apparently misunderstood the difference between what was "open" or "closed" (to all use) in 2008 under the consent decree vs. what might be designated as an "ORV route" (open to pedestrians too) or a "non-ORV area" in the future plan and regulation. The two types of information are clearly apples and oranges.

To give some hypothetical examples of how types of access might be distributed under the future plan, I presented the possible miles of designated ORV routes, seasonal routes, and non-ORV areas under the three NPS action alternatives (Alts C-E) that were presented at the November meeting, along with the following caveats:

At this point no decisions have been made and NPS has not yet selected a preferred alternative (I definitely expressed no preference for any of the three)

NPS must present a range of different alternatives in the draft EIS, which will be issued for public comment

NPS is awaiting the final Committee report to make a final determination if a fourth action alternative, based on the Committee's work, would be added

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.

"keene9558"
<keene9558@charte
r.net> To

03/28/2009 10:53 "'Mike Murray'"
AM <Mike_Murray@nps.gov> cc

Please respond to "'John Couch'"
<jkeene@frankline <guitarcouch@earthlink.net>,
g.com> "'Larry Hardham'"
<hardhead@embarqmail.com> Subject

Mike

I hope that we have not wasted 2 years. Has NPS already decided how they will slice & dice this Seashore? I recognize that you presented these as alternatives, (I always reminded my sales people to do the same) I hope the public is not being sold a product that is untested in the public forum.

Did the article not properly reflect your statements or did you fail to mention that all ORV Routes & Areas are open to pedestrians? If the statements are as published can we expect clarifications in the future?

From Thursday 3/26/09 Coastland Times relating talk by Mike Murray at Dare

County Tourism Board as reported by Jessica Horbach: (bold type added by me).

One possible alternative:

Open to ORV & pedestrian use year round - 26.6 miles
Seasonal open to ORV & year round to pedestrians - 30 miles
Open to pedestrians only - 11.7 miles

"Murray related, the easiest type of plan to implement would simply divide areas into two categories - where ORV's were allowed all year and areas where ORVs were not allowed."

Closed to ORV use - 40.4 miles
Open always to ORV & pedestrian use - 28 miles

Where might the "allocated" 28 miles be located?

I don't want to start a letter writing, public forum, but I need reasonable answers. We can only work together by sharing information and being forthright.

Thank you for your hard work during REG-NEG and the continuing processes.

Jim Keene