

0075413

From: ffff1@mindspring.com
Reply To: ffff1@mindspring.com
To: Mike Murray; Robert Fisher; keene9558 Keene; David Goodwin; smaddock@audubon.org; bsgould@msn.com
Subject: Routes and Areas Subcommittee
Date: 09/10/2008 11:53 AM

All,
After to long days of Neg Reg I wonder where we are. Mike at the meeting stated that he liked Sidney's proposals and the way it was set up better than the pro access document produced by Jim, Dave and myself. We do appreciate Mikes comments that both comments were good, but stated that our document would not pass legal muster by NPS/DOI in this process.

I have reviewed our proposal again since yesterday's meeting conclusion and cannot see any reason that the document does not meet the criteria of mandates of the executive order.

Furthermore I stand by my statement that as long as there are plans of any year round resource surf zone closures in the areas and routes portion of the negotiation that I will not give from my initial proposal before you now. I and I think most on the access side of the negotiating team agree with this stand.

Unless NPS/DOI come up with some type of document stating where they see the future of areas and routes are going to be can I make further comment on any reduction of the proposal we have on the table at this time. Mike, I believe that you are not the reason this has not been done I believe that everyone that is in this process on the pro-access side has little to no faith in the solicitor or Sandy and NPS/DOI in Washington. The rollover of DOI in front of Judge Boles and the stand taken in the Senate hearing have only caused further distrust in DOI/NPS and this process.

I will stand the course of the Negotiated Rule Making procees, but to say that I will change my present stand is questionable.

In order for my comments to be transparent I state that you may forward these comments to anyone you desire.

Frank Folb