

From: ffff1@mindspring.com
Reply To: ffff1@mindspring.com
To: [Robert Fisher](mailto:Robert.Fisher@franklineq.com); jkeene@franklineq.com; [Burnham Gould Jr.](mailto:Burnham.Gould.Jr.@yahoo.com); dagwerksobx@yahoo.com; destryjarvis@earthlink.net; smaddock@audubon.org; [Paul Stevens@nps.gov](mailto:Paul.Stevens@nps.gov)
Cc: [Pat Field](mailto:Pat.Field@nps.gov); [Ona Ferguson](mailto:Ona.Ferguson@nps.gov); [Cyndy Holda](mailto:Cyndy.Holda@nps.gov); jim.keene@ncbba.org; mike.murray@nps.gov
Subject: Re: Routes & Areas Subcommittee Call
Date: 08/14/2008 02:19 PM

Proposed agenda topics:

1) Release of subcommittee working documents to Island Press, implications for Subcommittee and Committee work:

Was I surprised about the disclosure, yes. Upset, No. After thinking about the subject on the way home I cannot say I was disturbed or disappointed. Our process should be transparent and without the appearance of smoke filled room agreements. It's now out there so with that let's keep going.

2) What did you include in your proposal to address concerns raised by other stakeholders?

The proposals from the two sides are far apart. Several members of free access went to great lengths with visits to constituents near Bodie Island, Hatteras Island and Ocracoke the proposal before you was our beginning offer. I am comfortable with talking about the Bodie Island Pedestrian area as accepted in Committee meetings already. I am willing to talk about 4 half mile pedestrian areas(1 between salvo and Avon, one between Avon and Buxton, one between NPS Line in Buxton and the southernmost Jetty at the light house and one between Frisco and Hatteras. On Ocracoke I will defer any pedestrian area to the Ocracoke representatives. Year round resource or village closures are off the table and truly I am do not agree with year round pedestrian areas anywhere. Resource overlays will take care of nesting birds and turtles and privatization of village beaches by oceanfront home owners is out of the question.

3) What are the similarities and major differences in the proposals? (map-by-map)

I can agree with:

Ramp 1 to ¼ mile east of Coquina Beach

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs
- Open Ramp 1 to ORVs

Coquina Beach to south ¾ mile

- Open to pedestrians (no ORV route)
- Move Ramp 2 to south end of pedestrian area

Ramp 2 to Ramp 4

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs

Rodanthe, Waves, and Salvo to Ramp 23

- Open to pedestrians
-

Open to ORVs in the off-season (dates to be decided by Villages Subcommittee or NPS)

- Expand parking lot at Ramp 23
- Construct pedestrian boardwalk just north of Ramp 23 so that pedestrians do not have to walk out ORV ramp to get to the beach

Ramp 23 – Ramp 27

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs

4) How to present proposals to the Committee? How to talk about the major differences with the Committee?

5) Should we have another Subcommittee call before the Committee meeting?

Avon Pier to Ramp 38

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs in the off-season (dates to be decided by Villages Subcommittee or NPS)
- Add additional parking to existing lot
- Construct a boardwalk parallel to HWY 12 from the parking lot to existing pedestrian boardwalk just south of Avon boundary

Ramp 38 to ½ mile north of Haulover Day Use Area

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs

½ mile south of Haulover Day Use Area to north groin, Buxton

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs
- Construct ramp south of Haulover Day Use Area to allow for ORV use south of Haulover

Ramp 43 to Ramp 45, including Cape Point

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs

Frisco Village, west boundary, to Hatteras Village, east boundary

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs in off-season (dates to be decided by Villages Subcommittee or NPS)

Construct new ramp to allow ORV use between Frisco Village and Hatteras Village

Hatteras Inlet to 1/10 mile west of Ramp 59

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs

1.3 miles east of Ramp 67 to .75 miles west of Ramp 67

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs

1/10 mile west of Ocracoke Day Use Area to Ramp 72

- Open to pedestrians
- Open to ORVs

4) How to present proposals to the Committee? How to talk about the major differences with the Committee?

The present consent decree cannot be the basis for beginning discussion on differences. No one (I think I am right) on the access side will allow any discussion to begin there. Presently under what we are operating is unacceptable and must be on the table for both sides to discuss. Unless the environmental side is willing to start with concessions from this point going further with the process is impossible. I stand by the idea that not only is there no need or requirement for permanent resource closures (We already have one 13 mile refuge within the seashore) and that the science behind the large buffers are flawed and unnecessary. Nowhere in any discussions with the committee or subgroups have I heard the word "take" used. This year a biologist doing his job had a bird become injured and die, but this was necessary to his work and in my mind acceptable. Fishermen in the area have been dealing with turtle and mammal takes for many years and although we all do not want any deaths they do occur and a percent of "take" is allowed with these fishermen. As an ORV advocate I want a percentage take for these species of concern before extra burdens of extended buffers and closures occur. These takes cannot be what somebody thinks happened to the bird or turtle, but factually proved. This was the problem Mike Murray was under before the section 7 USFW/NPS interim plan was instituted. Also different percentages must be used for threaten birds and birds of concern. Again unless the environmental side is willing to discuss and negotiate less restrictions than the consent decree we can come no closer than the two proposals on the table.

5) Should we have another Subcommittee call before the Committee meeting?

We will answer this question after discussing 1-5 above.

Frank Folb

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

From: Robert Fisher

Sent: Aug 14, 2008 7:13 AM

To: jkeene@franklineq.com, "Burnham Gould, Jr." , ffff1@mindspring.com, dagwerksobx@yahoo.com, destroyjarvis@earthlink.net, smaddock@audubon.org, "Paul_Stevens@nps.gov"

Cc: Pat Field , Ona Ferguson , Cyndy Holda , jim.keene@ncbba.org, mike_murray@nps.gov

Subject: Routes & Areas Subcommittee Call

Routes and Areas Subcommittee -

Our call is scheduled for Friday at 9 AM.

The call-in number is: 866-834-8757

Pass code: 614-492-1414

Proposed agenda topics:

- 1) Release of subcommittee working documents to Island Press, implications for Subcommittee and Committee work
- 2) What did you include in your proposal to address concerns raised by other stakeholders?
- 3) What are the similarities and major differences in the proposals? (map-by-map)
- 4) How to present proposals to the Committee? How to talk about the major differences with the Committee?
- 5) Should we have another Subcommittee call before the Committee meeting?

Please let everyone know if you have comments or suggestions for additional topics.

Robert

Fisher Collaborative Services LC

703.765.0999 | 202.302.1539 | rcf@fisherco.com