

**From:** [Burnham Gould, Jr.](#)  
**To:** [Michael Murray](#)  
**Cc:** [Pat Field](#); [Robert Fisher](#)  
**Subject:** RE: CAHA-Materials/Maps Prep: Horses  
**Date:** 01/29/2009 10:44 AM

---

Mike,

My view is that horses on the beach, at or close to the present level, are not a significant problem, certainly not worth making a big issue. If the use of horses grew significantly (which I don't anticipate) then regulations to severely restrict them would be necessary.

Burnie

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

> Subject: Re: CAHA-Materials/Maps Prep  
> To: cahabusinessallies@embarqmail.com  
> CC: allend@coastalnet.com; bobeakes@aginet.com; bsgould@msn.com; camerons@coastalnet.com; ccoucher@cox.net; chra07@yahoo.com; cyndy\_holda@nps.gov; dagwerksobx@yahoo.com; Darrell\_Echols@nps.gov; davandme@embarqmail.com; david\_rabon@fws.gov; destryljarvis@earthlink.net; ffff1@mindspring.com; hardhead@embarqmail.com; jim.keene@ncbba.org; jkeene@franklineq.com; jrylander@defenders.org; oferguson@cbuilding.org; pfield@cbuilding.org; rcf@fisherccs.com; rcmheritage@mac.com; rettied@hotmail.com; smaddock@audubon.org; tarwathie@clis.com; Thayer\_Broili@nps.gov; wgolder@audubon.org  
> From: Mike\_Murray@nps.gov  
> Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2009 10:10:24 -0500  
>  
> Judy,  
>  
>  
> I regret that the work session scheduling is causing so much unnecessary  
> angst. That really was not the intent. A number of us, me included,  
> cannot participate, but the work is beneficial and needs to be done. The  
> idea was that whoever is available to work with Robert and (now) the County  
> GIS specialist would map out the latest concepts being discussed by the  
> Routes and Areas and Natural Resource subcommittees, so that we have a way  
> to illustrate the current status of subcommittee negotiations at the Feb 3  
> meeting. My understanding is that the session will NOT involve ANY  
> negotiation on substantive issues, nor attempt to resolve any areas of  
> disagreement. I trust our colleagues (whoever can be there) will make a  
> good faith effort to accurately depict the current status of discussions  
> (i.e., areas of conceptual agreement, areas of disagreement, areas with  
> conflicting options, etc.); and truly do appreciate anyone who is available  
> to help with it. I also know that the work session was scheduled on short  
> notice, some of us cannot make it, and find no fault whatsoever in people  
> honoring their pre-existing commitments. If it turns out that any of us  
> disagrees with how they depict the status on the maps, then we will all  
> have the opportunity to add our 2 cents worth at the upcoming meeting.  
>  
> With regard to your concerns about topics that have not yet been discussed,  
> I for one have been listening to your concerns and think I understand your  
> interest in ensuring that the ORV plan does not unduly impact horseback  
> riding options in the Buxton area. Although horseback riding is outside  
> the scope of the plan (i.e., this is not a horse management plan and there  
> is no regulatory requirement to designate horse trails in a special  
> regulation), it is clear that there is the potential for the ORV plan to  
> negatively impact horseback riding opportunities. We are not stuck with

> the status quo restriction of horseback riding being limited only to areas  
> open to ORV use. I can and am willing to change that under my authority in  
> the Superintendent's Compendium to designate areas and trails for horseback  
> riding. However, until the ORV route designations are settled, the true  
> implications to horseback riding are unclear. It makes the most sense to me  
> to wait and see how the ORV routes & areas designations are settled (e.g.,  
> in the Buxton area), then it will be pretty straightforward to address the  
> implications to horseback riding (i.e., change the compendium).

>  
> What I don't know is what other concerns or ideas you have not brought up  
> yet. Given the limited amount of time remaining, we really do need to get  
> ALL issues on the table now. Similar to what other stakeholders have done  
> in identifying key areas for certain activities of interest to their  
> constituents (e.g., key watersport areas, criteria for pedestrian areas,  
> etc.), it would be very helpful if you could prepare a written list or  
> proposal of key areas for horseback riding and any other activities you  
> think have not been discussed yet. If there are certain areas or trails  
> you think should be open for a particular use, please include them (i.e.,  
> make a proposal). The list or proposal would preferably be a Word document  
> in brief bullet or outline format to clearly identify what you want.  
> Lengthy explanations or justifications are not needed. Even if some of  
> what you bring up is technically outside the scope of the ORV plan and  
> regulation, I would welcome the input. If the Committee is so inclined, I  
> would also welcome general advice from the Committee that NPS not  
> necessarily limit horse use only to designated ORV areas, as is being done  
> currently (although I am already convinced that it makes sense to change  
> the policy). I also would like to hear any feedback or concerns from other  
> Committee members about the use of horses in pedestrian areas on the beach  
> (i.e., is there a concern about horses in a nonbreeding foraging area that  
> is otherwise open to pedestrians?). In any case, by providing a written  
> list or proposal, it would become part of the Committee's administrative  
> record, you can demonstrate to your constituents that you are in fact  
> representing their interests, and it would give the Committee, facilitators  
> and me a better chance of factoring the information into the discussion in  
> the limited time remaining.

>  
> Thank you for your passion and commitment to representing your constituents  
> interests!

>  
> Mike Murray  
> Superintendent  
> Cape Hatteras NS/ Wright Brothers NMem/ Ft. Raleigh NHS  
> (w) 252-473-2111, ext. 148  
> (c) 252-216-5520  
> fax 252-473-2595

>  
> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE  
> This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which  
> it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is  
> proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from  
> disclosure.

>  
>  
>  
> Cape Hatteras  
> Business Allies  
> <cahabusinessalli To  
> es@embarqmail.com Carla Boucher <ccboucher@cox.net>  
> > cc  
> 'David Goodwin'

> 01/28/2009 09:50 <dagwerksobx@yahoo.com>, 'Robert  
> PM Fisher' <rcf@fisherccs.com>,  
> chra07@yahoo.com, 'Sidney Maddock'  
> <smaddock@audubon.org>,  
> jim.keene@ncbba.org,  
> ffff1@mindspring.com, 'Destry  
> Jarvis'  
> <destryjarvis@earthlink.net>,  
> davandme@embarqmail.com,  
> bsgould@msn.com,  
> allend@coastalnet.com,  
> bobeakes@aginet.com,  
> camerons@coastalnet.com,  
> david\_rabon@fws.gov,  
> hardhead@embarqmail.com, 'Karen &  
> Dwight Rettie'  
> <tarwathie@clis.com>,  
> rcmheritage@mac.com,  
> rettied@hotmail.com,  
> wgolder@audubon.org, 'Mike Murray'  
> <Mike\_Murray@nps.gov>, 'Pat Field'  
> <pfield@cbuilding.org>, 'Cyndy  
> Holda' <cyndy\_holda@nps.gov>, 'Ona  
> Ferguson'  
> <oferguson@cbuilding.org>,  
> jkeene@franklineq.com,  
> Darrell\_Echols@nps.gov, 'Jason  
> Rylander'  
> <jrylander@defenders.org>,  
> Thayer\_Broili@nps.gov  
> Subject  
> Re: CAHA-Materials/Maps Prep  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> No actually Carla I am not asking that at this time, I asked that last  
> week, TWICE! Since the facilitators never responded, I am left feeling  
> as if my availability has indeed been discounted! On top of not being  
> afforded the time to advocate for my constituents at our last meeting! I  
> don't think very many members of the committee actually have a grasp on  
> how economy is intertwined with any decisions that that the park makes  
> and the complexity of it! There are very real consequences to the  
> economy that are at stake here and all I ever hear about is peoples  
> concern about birds! All these little things that are being compromised  
> add up to a LOT of unhappy visitors! I am one of the few people on the  
> committee who actually interacts with all the various user groups on a  
> regular basis!  
>  
> In so far as OUR subcommittee goes, I have \*\_not\*\_ agreed to any of the  
> proposed documents, nor have I had an opportunity to make a case on why  
> they are not acceptable to me, due to the deliberate withholding of  
> information and the lack of participation of many of that sub committees

- > members, and a day and a half of our meeting time being spent discussing
- > pedestrian issues! Yet we \_never\_ had any discussion about the rest of
- > the beach users! We never had any discussion regarding the economy, when
- > it comes to specific areas on the map and how important they may or may
- > not be! Where are the needs being balanced?
- >
- > While I know in my heart of hearts that people will never be as
- > important as birds in this matter, why would those advocating for the
- > birds ever give an inch when they have not ever been given the
- > information needed in order to understand what their proposals will do
- > the residents and visitors? Not that I think they will actually care or
- > that it will make a difference, but I can't in my own good conscience
- > agree to things that will be detrimental to those I represent just for
- > the sake of consensus! Especially when it seems to have been ignored! So
- > what does consensus get us? Am I to walk away with some warm fuzzy
- > feeling about a consensus that will kill my communitys economy, well
- > what is left of it anyway!
- >
- > When exactly where any of us asked about our availability? By whom?
- >
- > Judy
- >
- >
- >
- > Carla Boucher wrote:
- >
- > >Well.
- > >
- > >Judy, are you asking us not to have the work session Friday and Saturday?
- >
- > >
- > >Do you all realize the exercise of assimilating all the information into a
- > >single package is for the benefit of all of us? WE ARE ONLY AS SMART AS
- > >OUR
- > >DUMBEST COMMITTEE MEMBER (emphasizing, not yelling).
- > >
- > >I certainly never meant to cause angst by suggesting I needed some maps to
- > >pull together all the proposals we've received over the past 13 months.
- > >
- > >I certainly never meant to discount anyone's availability, and never meant
- > >to specifically discount your availability Judy. I would have been
- > >ecstatic
- > >to have the product completed last week without any work on my part, God
- > >knows like all of you I have enough work to do as it is.
- > >
- > >All I know is that on February 3rd each one of us is being asked to reach
- > >consensus or at least negotiate on all the pieces of the puzzle that have
- > >been presented to us over the past 13 months. This might be unfair or
- > >ridiculous or stupid, but that's the reality of where we are. It's clear
- > >we're not getting any more meetings between 2/03 and 2/26. It's clear
- > >that
- > >we're now at the 12th hour. At every meeting I have heard from others,
- > >and
- > >said it myself, that I can't possibly digest all this information verbally
- > >or digest it in a half hour while someone else is talking. Therefore, I
- > >have a responsibility to gather the information in advance of the meeting.
- > >The pieces of information I need include
- > >
- > >\* maps indicating PROPOSED (maybe marginally agreed upon, maybe not)
- > >concepts

- > > ~ pre-nesting closures
- > > ~ nesting buffers
- > > ~ migrating closure proposals
- > > ~ turtle nesting history to indicate possible turtle closure
- > impacts
- > > in the future
- > > ~ a routes/areas maps indicating which areas if any are open
- > to ORV
- > > and which areas, if any, are closed to ORVs
- > > ~ a village closures map (if not indicated on routes/areas
- > map)
- > >
- > > \* Subcommittee working documents
- > > ~ Adaptive Management Proposal for Night Access during Sea
- > Turtle
- > > Nesting and Hatchling Season
- > > ~ Adaptive Management Proposal during Sea Turtle Nesting and
- > > Hatching Season Morning Beach Access Reopening
- > > ~ Self-contained Vehicle camping on Cape Hatteras National
- > Seashore
- > > ~ ORV Safety Closures
- > > ~ Draft Natural Resource Subcommittee Document proposed
- > resource
- > > protection table
- > > ~ Reducing or Removing bird closures prior to August 31
- > document
- > > ~ Vehicle Characteristics document
- > > ~ Permits/passes document - there are currently 2 proposals
- > > unresolved
- > > ~ Village closure dates, locations, times, etc.
- > >
- > > I'll admit that I'm probably not the sharpest tool in the shed and am one
- > > fry shy of a happy meal when it comes to digesting all this information.
- > >
- > > So maybe the only thing that will make everyone (but me) happy is to just
- > > leave the committee members to their own devices and let them get prepared
- > > on their own time with their own materials at their own expense. That way
- > > no one is excluded 1/30 or 1/31.
- > >
- > > I sincerely hope that the rest of the committee can do a thorough job of
- > > figuring out a way to integrate all this information into a single
- > package.
- > > Because if even 1 person comes to the meeting unprepared they will
- > directly
- > > jeopardize my chance at reaching consensus. WE ARE ONLY AS SMART AS OUR
- > > DUMBEST COMMITTEE MEMBER (emphasizing, not yelling). Nearly 2,000 pages
- > of
- > > e-mails and documents later it seems like an overwhelming job to me to
- > > figure out where we're at conceptually and tentatively but that's what's
- > > being asked of us and that's what I'm going to do, by hook or by crook.
- > >
- > > I'm available this weekend or not. Either way I'll be working on this for
- > > my own edification, I care not whether I'm working at my office in
- > Virginia
- > > or working with others in North Carolina.
- > >
- > > Carla
- > >
- > > Carla Boucher, Attorney
- > > United Four Wheel Drive Associations

> >P.O. Box 15696  
> >Chesapeake, VA 23328  
> >(757) 546-7969  
> >  
> >-----Original Message-----  
> >From: Cape Hatteras Business Allies  
> >[mailto:cahabusinessallies@embarqmail.com]  
> >Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2009 4:15 PM  
> >To: Carla Boucher  
> >Cc: 'David Goodwin'; 'Robert Fisher'; chra07@yahoo.com; 'Sidney Maddock';  
> >jim.keene@ncbba.org; ffff1@mindspring.com; 'Destry Jarvis';  
> >davandme@embarqmail.com; bsgould@msn.com; allend@coastalnet.com;  
> >bobeakes@aginet.com; camerons@coastalnet.com; david\_rabon@fws.gov;  
> >hardhead@embarqmail.com; 'Karen & Dwight Rettie'; rcmheritage@mac.com;  
> >rettied@hotmail.com; wgolder@audubon.org; 'Mike Murray'; 'Pat Field';  
> >'Cyndy  
> >Holda'; 'Ona Ferguson'; jkeene@franklineq.com; Darrell\_Echols@nps.gov;  
> >'Jason Rylander'; Thayer\_Broili@nps.gov  
> >Subject: Re: CAHA-Materials/Maps Prep  
> >  
> >All-  
> >Well, at the end of last meeting, until I overheard somebody say  
> >something about working after church, I had no idea that there was any  
> >discussion about working this upcoming weekend. At that time I did make  
> >it \_clear\_ that I was unavailable this coming Saturday and Sunday!  
> >Somebody threw out the idea of why not LAST weekend, or this week and I  
> >heard Patrick say he was not available, but Robert might be. So I had  
> >been waiting for an e-mail setting something up, but it never came.  
> >  
> >After the meeting, I sent out an e-mail voicing my displeasure over  
> >several things that had occurred during the 5 days of sub-committee  
> >meetings last week and have not received any response from anyone other  
> >than Frank Folb, part of that e-mail included the fact that there was  
> >obviously some sort of discussion going on about schedules, but \_most of  
> >us were not privy to it\_, which is why I pointed out in my e-mail that  
> >it would be nice if all of us were asked about our availability BEFORE  
> >plans were made. Again, I stated I was unavailable this Sat & Sun, but I  
> >was available the entire 7 days prior. I never heard that Carla and NPS  
> >were not available all of last week until now.  
> >  
> >I have been expecting some type of meeting, but until Robert's e-mail  
> >this am, all I was aware of was the "open house" meeting on February  
> >2nd, for the full committee. So despite my repeated efforts at making it  
> >clear that I was not available this weekend, apparently the plan to  
> >shoot for a work weekend 1/30 that only a few were aware of, was put in  
> >place anyway. I thought the general feeling in the room at the end of  
> >the meeting was that we were in no way ready to put anything together to  
> >present to the entire committee and that we needed another day or two of  
> >meetings, apparently I was at a different meeting than the rest of you  
> >were at.  
> >  
> >That being said, after attending EVERY workshop, full meeting as well as  
> >sub-committee meeting ever held, I really don't appreciate my  
> >availability being discounted as unimportant at the eleventh hour and I  
> >doubt I can or will agree to anything that is being put on a map without  
> >input regarding how business interests will or can be affected. Up to  
> >this point little if any consideration has been given to that topic,  
> >when I have tried to point this out, there is never enough time to  
> >discuss it, but everything else seems to have been given the utmost  
> >consideration. Time is running out and there is very little opportunity

> >if any for socio/economic considerations to be taken into account. So  
> >once again I will be denied the opportunity for input due to the  
> >scheduling of a work weekend that I made very clear that I was unable to  
> >attend.  
> >  
> >I am going to make it VERY clear to my constituents that their needs  
> >went unheard and that despite making numerous attempts to broach the  
> >subject, we were essentially shut out of the process.  
> >  
> >I really appreciate my schedule being taken into consideration the one  
> >and only time I said I was not available, after ALL of the times I have  
> >rearranged my schedule to attend \_every meeting\_! I doubt my presence  
> >will be needed on Friday since it obviously is not needed over the  
> >weekend, and I don't want to get involved with something that will  
> >continue on Saturday and Sunday, knowing full well I cannot be there to  
> >see it through.\_  
> >  
> >\_Good luck with your maps and reaching consensus!  
> >Judy  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >Carla Boucher wrote:  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >>Dave, in the half hour before we adjourned Thurs. 1/22 the joined  
> >>  
> >>  
> >committees  
> >  
> >  
> >>spoke about how to prepare our information for the full committee on or  
> >>prior to 2/03. Judy said she was available 1/23 but not available 1/30.  
> >I  
> >>said I was available any time the week of 1/26 but unavailable 1/23. NPS  
> >>  
> >>  
> >is  
> >  
> >  
> >>unavailable this week due to work load considerations for consent decree  
> >>reporting requirements. I can't remember what everyone else said exactly  
> >>but the discussion then went on about meeting 1/30, 1/31, 2/01 after  
> >>  
> >>  
> >church,  
> >  
> >  
> >>and staying until it was done. That conversation then changed to working  
> >>Fri. and Sat. based on availability of a facility to work at, Robert's  
> >>schedule, etc. I also have believe this to be a work meeting, not a  
> >>subcommittee meeting. We will be trying to bring documents and maps  
> >>together that simplify or condense our collective efforts thus far. I  
> >have  
> >>no intention of revisiting any "issues".  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>This is a work party. If you've got the time to help translate our

> current  
> >>status into a map or outline an already developed work document in Word  
> >>  
> >>  
> >then  
> >  
> >  
> >>please come and help. If you don't have the time then don't come. All  
> >>you're missing out on is the grunt work, not the decision-making. :-)  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>While I don't presume to speak for Robert or anyone else, I did want to  
> >>share with you my recollection of how we got from there to here. I was  
> >>under the impression that all of you standing in the room were under the  
> >>same impression I was that we were shooting for a work weekend 1/30 so  
> >>Robert's e-mail didn't take me by surprise.  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>Carla  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>Carla Boucher, Attorney  
> >>  
> >>United Four Wheel Drive Associations  
> >>  
> >>P.O. Box 15696  
> >>  
> >>Chesapeake, VA 23328  
> >>  
> >>(757) 546-7969  
> >>  
> >> \_\_\_\_\_  
> >>  
> >>From: David Goodwin [mailto:dagwerksobx@yahoo.com]  
> >>Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2009 1:54 PM  
> >>To: Robert Fisher; chra07@yahoo.com; Sidney Maddock; jim.keene@ncbba.org;  
> >>ffff1@mindspring.com; Destry Jarvis; davandme@embarqmail.com;  
> >>bsgould@msn.com; allend@coastalnet.com; bobeakes@aginet.com;  
> >>cahabusinessallies@embarqmail.com; camérons@coastalnet.com;  
> >>ccboucher@cox.net; david\_rabon@fws.gov; hardhead@embarqmail.com; Karen &  
> >>Dwight Rettie; rcmheritage@mac.com; rettied@hotmail.com;  
> >>  
> >>  
> >wgolder@audubon.org  
> >  
> >  
> >>Cc: Mike Murray; Pat Field; Cyndy Holda; Ona Ferguson;  
> >>jkeene@franklineq.com; Darrell\_Echols@nps.gov; Jason Rylander;  
> >>Thayer\_Broili@nps.gov  
> >>Subject: Re: CAHA-Materials/Maps Prep  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>Robert,  
> >>  
> >> I know we are in a rush to get things done, but I need to remind you  
> >>that 2 days notice is insufficient for some of us. I can attend, but I



> >>don't know if Judy or some of the other folks will be able to make it.  
> >>Plans have been made that may not be able to be cancelled. Not  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>complaining,  
> >  
> >  
> >>but just pointing out the situation.  
> >>  
> >>David Goodwin  
> >>dagwerksobx@yahoo.com  
> >>  
> >>----- Original Message -----  
> >>  
> >>From: Robert Fisher <mailto:rcf@fisherics.com>  
> >>  
> >>To: David Goodwin <mailto:dagwerksobx@yahoo.com> ; chra07@yahoo.com ;  
> >>Sidney <mailto:smaddock@audubon.org> Maddock ; jim.keene@ncbba.org ;  
> >>ffff1@mindspring.com ; Destry <mailto:destryjarvis@earthlink.net> Jarvis  
> ;  
> >>davandme@embarqmail.com ; bsgould@msn.com ; allend@coastalnet.com ;  
> >>bobeakes@aginet.com ; cahabusinessallies@embarqmail.com ;  
> >>camerons@coastalnet.com ; ccboucher@cox.net ; davandme@embarqmail.com ;  
> >>david\_rabon@fws.gov ; hardhead@embarqmail.com ; Karen  
> >><mailto:tarwathie@clis.com> & Dwight Rettie ; rcmheritage@mac.com ;  
> >>rettied@hotmail.com ; wgolder@audubon.org  
> >>  
> >>Cc: Mike Murray <mailto:Mike\_Murray@nps.gov> ; Pat Field  
> >><mailto:pfield@cbuilding.org> ; Cyndy Holda <mailto:cyndy\_holda@nps.gov>  
> >>  
> >>  
> > ;  
> >  
> >  
> >>Ona <mailto:oferguson@cbuilding.org> Ferguson ; jkeene@franklineq.com ;  
> >>Darrell\_Echols@nps.gov ; Jason <mailto:jrylander@defenders.org> Rylander  
> ;  
> >>Thayer\_Broilli@nps.gov ; Thayer\_Broilli@nps.gov  
> >>  
> >>Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2009 11:26 AM  
> >>  
> >>Subject: CAHA-Materials/Maps Prep  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>All,  
> >>  
> >>As discussed last week we will be working on the maps and status of  
> routes  
> >>and areas for the Committee starting Friday morning. The County has  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>offered  
> >  
> >  
> >>us both meeting space and GIS assistance. Let's plan to start at 9:30 AM  
> >>  
> >>  
> >at  
> >

0076381

> >  
> >>the County Administration Building in Manteo. Please let us know if you  
> >>plan to attend.  
> >>  
> >>Robert and Pat  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
>  
>  
>