

From: [Darrell Echols](#)
To: [Mike Murray](#)
Subject: Re: Ramp 23
Date: 08/20/2009 06:38 AM

Mike,

Thanks. The closure is still needed. We have one chick left, which should fledge in roughly two weeks. We'll decide what to do this morning and put out a press release. I'll call Kevin and Rudy.

Darrell

▼ [Mike Murray](#)

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

From: Mike Murray
Sent: 08/19/2009 11:03 PM EDT
To: Darrell Echols
Cc: Cyndy Holda
Subject: Re: Ramp 23

Darrell

The situation is unprecedented and not covered explicitly in the Consent Decree. In other words, you have the discretion to do what you think is necessary and appropriate under the circumstances. The cable gate sounds "reasonable" but will undoubtedly anger some in the ORV community, so it is worth considering the +/- of doing it. Some things to think about:

- Probably need to publicize the violation since it was deliberate, even if you decide not to expand it.
- You could expand it to the south another 500 meters, since that is the last/highest increment identified in the CD.
- How much longer is the underlying bird closure still in effect? If the closure/expanded closure that keeps getting violated was based originally on a bird closure AND the need for a bird closure no longer exists, then I see no reason to perpetuate a closure that is no longer necessary.
- It may be good to let Rudy Renfer and Kevin McCardle know by email what the situation is, how you plan to handle it (based on your interpretation of what sections of the CD). My experience has been that the AUSA usually can react to my planned course of action, but they usually don't tell us what to do or how to do it. We simply let them know so they are aware in case one of the parties objects.
- Better surveillance is a good idea and a stakeout may even be productive given the circumstances.

Bottom line: Check to see that the original closure is still needed and for how long, so we are not perpetuating a penalty expansion of a closure that is no longer justified. If the original closure is still justified, then expanding, publicizing and installing a more substantial barrier may be worthwhile, even with the likely backlash it may generate. If you do the latter, need to be proactive in explaining your actions in a press release and try to make the problem behavior the focal point.

In any case, it is a judgment call. Good luck!

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

▼ Darrell Echols

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

From: Darrell Echols
Sent: 08/19/2009 09:53 PM EDT
To: Mike Murray
Cc: Cyndy Holda
Subject: Ramp 23

Mike,

I am sorry to bother you, but I need a little guidance.

Ramp 23 was violated Sunday and Monday night, which constitutes the second and third violations. The west boundary was already at the parking lot from a violation that occurred in June. We extended the north boundary to the village closure and added more signage, but did not extend the closure into the village. We extended the southern boundary 600 meters (100 for Sunday and 500 for Monday as per the consent decree). None of this affected ORV access because of the safety closure in the village and a full beach turtle closure .82 miles south of the Ramp 23 closure.

Here's the issue. Ramp 23 was violated again last night making it the fourth time. I asked Jon Anglin to install surveillance cameras last night, but they didn't do it due to technical difficulties. They are installing the cameras tonight and having someone undercover all night.

The closure has been expanded as far to the north, west, and east that it can. We could extend the south boundary another 500 meters, but that doesn't help deter the vandalism because it doesn't affect ORV's. I am inclined to install a cable across the ramp instead of vehicle barricades. This would at least be a physical deterremnt.

Thoughts? Other ideas? Do you want me to call the AUSA?

Sorry to bother you.

Darrell