

From: [Mike Murray](#)
To: [Mary Helen Goodloe-Murphy](#)
Bcc: [Cyndy Holda](#); [Darrell Echols](#)
Subject: Re: Beach plan and budget
Date: 12/17/2010 05:10 PM

Hi Mary Helen,

The operating cost estimates for the action alternatives, including Alternative F, described in Chapter 2, Table 8, p. 125, would generally be covered by a combination of existing ONPS funding and potential ORV permit revenues. (Note: The Alternative B estimate is a rough approximation of how current ONPS funding is used, projected forward.) In other words, ORV permit revenues would pay for additional program-related costs above and beyond those already provided by existing ONPS funding. As a result, no additional ONPS increase is expected to be needed for implementation of Alternative F.

Hope this helps explain it.

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.

▼ [Mary Helen Goodloe-Murphy <atmmhgm@aol.com>](mailto:atmmhgm@aol.com)

Mary Helen Goodloe-Murphy
<atmmhgm@aol.com>

To Mike_Murray@nps.gov
cc

Subject Beach plan and budget

12/17/2010 07:12 AM

Hi Mike:

I don't understand our budget conversation yesterday. As I understand, you said the seashore does not need an increase in the base budget to implement the plan.

The final statement estimates the annual cost of staffing and materials of the preferred alternative as \$3,632,150, distributed as follows: protection \$1.96 million, resource management \$943,950, management/administration

\$274,150, facilities \$194,100 and interpretation \$263,850.

So, this annual cost is already covered in the base budget?

Mary Helen