

From: [Burnham Gould, Jr.](#)
To: [Robert Fisher](#); [Jim Lyons](#)
Cc: [Michael Murray](#)
Subject: RE: CAHA Meetings Next Week
Date: 01/16/2009 02:51 PM

Hi, Robert.

Thank you for your reply. You certainly have a difficult job. I admire your patience.

Next Tuesday is Inauguration Day. A group of us will be getting together at 11:00 am for an inauguration party. I have already rescheduled my teaching commitment at the Oregon Inlet Coast Guard Station for that day in order to participate in the party. I don't think that it would be appropriate to renege on that commitment now. However, I would be happy to meet with you earlier in the day, perhaps at 8:00 am, for a couple of hours.

As you know, Jim is the principal representing the Cape Hatteras Recreational Alliance. When I vote in his absence I try to represent the views of that organization as I understand them, to the best of my ability. What follows are my personal views, not necessarily the views of the the Cape Hatteras Recreational Alliance.

I feel that the proposal that Sidney, Destry and I made last September is a good compromise proposal that reflects major concessions to the "open access group". I don't really like it but I can live with it. If one reads the Organic Act and other legal constraints placed upon the Park Service in developing a plan for ORV management it is hard to believe that the open access group will see a proposal that has a real chance of being implemented that is more generous to their interests, especially if one considers likely budget constraints upon the Park Service. I also think that two of the alternatives presented by the Park Service, Alternatives C and D, might be worth considering. In particular, Alternative C is very generous to ORV interests.

One way or another, use of ORVs on beaches is going to be much more restricted in the future than it has been in the past. The RegNeg meetings have made it crystal clear that many, perhaps most, local folks have not yet come to terms with the coming changes. Also, they feel that they have nothing to lose because their livelihood and way of life is being threatened. I certainly can sympathize with their predicament. The best thing that you can do, as an unbiased, neutral mediator, is to help these folks see how they can adapt to the forthcoming changes and continue to lead happy, rewarding, productive lives.

Burnie

Burnham S. Gould, Jr. P.O. Box 54, Frisco, NC 27936-0054

> From: rcf@fisherccs.com
> To: chra07@yahoo.com; bsgould@msn.com
> Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2009 12:06:27 -0600
> Subject: CAHA Meetings Next Week
>
> Jim and Burnie,
>
> I'm responding to your messages and communications with Ona. Are either or
> both of you available to meet with me on Tuesday next week? We are still
> planning for a joint Routes/Areas and Natural Resources meeting on
> Wednesday.
>
> I know you preferred not to extend the meeting dates beyond Feb 3. We
> discussed the pros and cons with Mike Murray. He decided it was in the best
> interests of the Committee and NPS to allow the Committee a little more time
> to try to further resolve or narrow the remaining areas of disagreement.

- > While there is no guarantee of progress, to make any progress everyone will
- > need to reconsider their current positions on the unresolved issues in order
- > to reach a compromise and comprehensive package that can be implemented.
- >
- > Robert
- > _____
- > Fisher Collaborative Services LC
- > 703.765.0999 | 202.302.1539 | rcf@fisherco.com
- >