

**From:** [ffff1@mindspring.com](mailto:ffff1@mindspring.com)  
**Reply To:** [ffff1@mindspring.com](mailto:ffff1@mindspring.com)  
**To:** [Mike Murray](#)  
**Subject:** Today's Routes and area call.  
**Date:** 07/28/2008 04:00 PM

---

Mike,  
 Here is a rough summary of what the 5 person head to head meeting talked about.  
 Frank

Jim, Dave and I met with Bernie Gould and Sidney Maddock yesterday from > 3:00PM until after 6:30 PM on routes and areas.  
 >  
 > Meetin was good positive informational with good positions taken by both > sides - Lot's of areas from Sidney that he and AS had no conflict on those > areas -  
 > Oceanside there were 6 major areas of concern -  
 >  
 > First let me state - "RESOURCE ISSUES WERE NOT DISCUSSED ABOUT ARES THEY > TOOK NO POSITION ON BEING AGAINST ROUTES AND ARES BEING IN THE AREAS.  
 >  
 > Second state: On dumpsters he requested we include "Predator Proof > dumpsters and fish cleaning areas. Sidney also questioned whether the > shell and clay would be comfortable with walking and we explained the CAMA > requirements as to why we used this description.  
 >  
 > Third state: In areas where we have requests for defoliating and making > resource friendly they encourage and think the ideas have merit when done > legally and with research and development to assure they are done > properly.  
 >  
 > Fourth state: Bernie stated that his vision was that no vehicles would be > permitted on the beach, but was agreeable with negotiated pedestrian > areas and I will detail some of those in what follows.  
 >  
 > Bodie Island spit - Sidney did not have any objections to a corridor > around the edge but questioned the 300 ft. corridor as excessive. The > interdunal road was discussed and problems he saw such as disturbing > habitat if to far to the east were problematic and he question 504 wetlands > allowing it to run far enough to the west but he did understand the need > for such a road. I believe the ciments at this point made the meeting more > successful with the thought process we saw him using in his discussion.  
 >  
 > From Pea Island Border to ramp 27 he had no issues except the numbers of > ramps desired.  
 >  
 > Issues from 27-30 - He and the environmental group want this closed > yearround for pedestrian only due to being a very favorable area for bird > use due to erosion of dunes and structure of beach.  
 >  
 > From ramp 30 south to Ramp 43 Sidney had no issues with document we had > for areas and routes. Bernie had issues with area south of Ramp 38 that > was extended last year and this year allowing ORV use and wanted the areas > from haul over to Buxton to be pedestrian only Area. Also north of 43 > area opened this year was of concerned and stated there was some negative > conversation within his group about it reopening this year and that it > should be closed year round. (Jim's Private Beach)  
 >  
 > From 43 to Ramp 45 and the interdunal road in the area. Sidney stated his > group was disagreeing with the protocols here due to the extreme > importance of the area for the community. He did think our outline of the > corridor and area at Cape Point were excessive and even chuckled at the > 1,000 meter arc we showed at Cape Point knowing where the distance came > from. But there is a big trade-off here for leaving protocol at Cape Point > as described next. Sidney included a bigger and better parking area in > the area of ramp 43 but due to overwas and wetland knew it may be hard to > acquire.  
 >  
 > From 45 to ramp 49 - He agrees with the interdunal road from 45 to 49 if > possible. However no ramps to the beach because he wants yearround closure > west of 45 to .1 mile east of Ramp 49 except for dory commercial net > fishermen and pedestrian traffic. We were then introduced to another > species of bird he is interested in - redknots -  
 >  
 > Ramp 49 to Frisco line - Bernie explained that if we accepted the closures > to the east of 49 he had no standing to ask for closure west of 49 to > the village line, but had there not been a closure east he wanted that > closed year round.  
 >  
 > Frisco East Village Line west to ramp 55 no variance from our plan, except > that Sidney thought that the Ramp east of Hatteras had overwash problems > and that he thought that in the future there would be an inlet there > again.  
 >  
 >  
 > From Ramp 55 oceanside to about where the cable crossing on Pole Road is > no problem with a corridor but questioned to 200 ft one in our discussion > paper. From that point to the rip he wants yearround closure to ORV > oceanside, but wanted to discuss with environmental side the possibility > of a soundside access via poleroad and the last crossover from the beach > to the rip. This would exclude false point from ORV use.  
 >  
 >  
 > Ocracoke  
 > Ramp 59 East - Protocol 2  
 >

> Ramp 59 west to Ramp 72 No objections until we get to ramp 72 and the  
> airport.  
>  
> Ramp 72 - Two options by environmentists are being discussed.  
> 1. Option now on table - Protocol 2 from Ramp 72 to inlet  
>  
> 2. This option would set up an areas west of airport strip to the inlet as  
> a wilderness area that no ORV use would be allowed year round ocean to  
> sound.  
>  
> Soundside access:  
> Only 2 areas that he had problems with - Overwas fan area of pole road the  
> idea of raising and adding shell and clay would not be desired here as it  
> may impede overwash.  
>  
> Ocracoke inlet: Interdunal road may have 504 wetland problems and the  
> "Wilderness Designation would not allow and interdunal access at all.  
>  
> Although this a rough draft of our discussion I came away feeling we had  
> covered more area than any 8 hours at Neg Reg and that although there are  
> major disagreements in the areas above that there are many areas of  
> agreement that most of the environment side would not impede. I would have  
> no problem sending this email to Bernie and Sidney for their comment as to  
> what we discussed and what I heard.  
>  
>  
>  
> Frank