

0075266

From: Jim Lyons
Reply To: chra07@yahoo.com
To: Robert Fisher
Cc: johnalley@earthlink.net; sonnyduke@aol.com; royatteachs@earthlink.net; MFCREP@bigfoot.com; nonresidentowner@aol.com; chra07@yahoo.com; kayota@cox.net; Mike_Murray@nps.gov
Subject: Re: Village Closure Options
Date: 08/29/2008 04:54 PM

My apology to all the committee members for me being late to the call and thanks to Wayne for alerting me that the call had started.

I will entertain and consider any plans and ideas for moving an ORV plan forward.

With regard to Village Closures, I am acceptable to extending or changing the boundaries of where village start and stop. If our subcommittee wants to include the area between Hatteras and Frisco as part of the Villages boundaries I could agree to that as long as we have discussions about other potential areas outside of but contiguous to other villages in the Seashore (Nags Head, Tri Villages, Avon and Ocracoke) and consider them all in one package. In other words put them all out there and agree to consensus (in the sub-committee) of them all at one time, or present more than one proposal if we cannot reach consensus.

I think extending village boundaries is a more difficult task and that we will be overlapping the "Routes and Areas" subcommittee's charge. It seems evident to me that the Routes and Areas and Village Closures are closely linked. If this query moves our discussion forward I am happy with negotiations dealing with this topic and will commit the necessary time towards it.

I would like to find a way to define and agree upon certain terms that have come up in our discussion. The terms "adaptive management" and "multiple use" I believe have different connotations to me from other members of the committee.

Adaptive management to me means that some areas have adapted to certain uses over the years. Some specific examples come to mind; no driving in the villages (Buxton, Frisco and Hatteras) year round, motorized access to Cape Point (because it is logistically difficult for recreational fishermen to access this area without ORV access) and a year round pedestrian area from the Old Lighthouse site and at ramp 43 (abundant parking facilities and good walking beach have made that area attractive to non-ORV visitors). When formulating an ORV management plan adaptive management should incorporate, where feasible, those zones of use that is or has been particularly adapted to a specific type of use.

I have concerns when adaptive management changes long established use patterns. In addition I am not comfortable with leaving open-ended potential future changes for village closures dates or boundaries or year round pedestrian access only areas unless we can agree on very specific criteria that would trigger those changes.

Similarly, I have a very different understanding of what "multiple use" means. I think I agree with the principle of "multiple use" in the Park. In a "multiple use" pedestrian access only zone users can engage in a wide range of activities that are compatible with the resource such as walking, swimming, surfing, kite boarding, fishing, shelling, nature viewing, running, sunbathing, picnicking and many others. All of these activities can be done without the aid of a motorized vehicle and many of them are greatly enhanced for many visitors in areas that are not ORV trails. It has been my impression that ORV use by the committee was defined primarily as an issue of access and not a recreational activity per se in our discussions.

Thanks to all for their input,

Jim

--- On Thu, 8/28/08, Robert Fisher <rcf@fisherccs.com> wrote:

```
> From: Robert Fisher <rcf@fisherccs.com>
> Subject: Village Closure Options
> To: johnalley@earthlink.net, sonnyduke@aol.com, royatteachs@earthlink.net, MFCREP@bigfoot.com,
nonresidentowner@aol.com, chra07@yahoo.com, "kayota@cox.net" <kayota@cox.net>, "Mike_Murray@nps.gov"
<Mike_Murray@nps.gov>
> Cc: "Pat Field" <pfield@cbuilding.org>, "Ona Ferguson" <oferguson@cbuilding.org>, "Cyndy Holda"
<cyndy_holda@nps.gov>, "vsanguineti@comcast.net" <vsanguineti@comcast.net>, "Paul_Stevens@nps.gov"
<Paul_Stevens@nps.gov>
> Date: Thursday, August 28, 2008, 1:26 PM
> All,
>
> I had a computer problem that delayed getting this out to
> you. As we
> discussed, attached is a draft document with the two middle
> options
> mentioned on our call on Tuesday. As you will see, I
> included the safety
> closure concept, although not mentioned on our call it was
> discussed
> previously. Also attached for reference is the latest
> draft safety closure
> approach from NPS (dated July 30, 2008). Please let me
> know if anything is
> missing or incorrectly stated.
>
> Please let everyone know your views on the middle options
> and if you can
> live with either or both. If there's one you cannot live
> with, please
> describe one thing that would have to change to make it
> acceptable.
> Alternatively, you can propose another option for the
```

0075267

> subcommittee to
> consider.
>
> Also, please indicate if you want to go ahead with the
> subcommittee call we
> scheduled for next Tuesday (9/2) at 11 AM.
>
> Robert