

From: [Jim Lyons](mailto:Jim.Lyons@nps.gov)
Reply To: chra07@yahoo.com
To: [Mike Murray@nps.gov](mailto:Mike.Murray@nps.gov)
Subject: Re: CAHA-Materials/Maps Prep
Date: 02/02/2009 03:08 PM

Mike,
 The only concern I have is with horses on narrow forrest trails in the NPS Maritime Forrest. Other National Parks (Gettysburg) distinguish pedestrian trails from horse trails, with good reason.

I am not opposed to horse trail in the Seashore in the Maritime Forrest if the trail is large enough like Open Pond Road. The Nature Trail in Buxton would not be appropriate for horses. Horse on the beach in pedestrian access only areas not in front of the villages present no problem to pedestrians given the limited amount of horse use on the beach. Maritime Forrest trails should be named and designated as either horse or pedestrian trails. Horse trails might not be appropriate on some village beaches seasonally. Avon, Frisco, Hatteras.

Jim

--- On Thu, 1/29/09, Mike_Murray@nps.gov <Mike_Murray@nps.gov> wrote:

```

> From: Mike_Murray@nps.gov <Mike_Murray@nps.gov>
> Subject: Re: CAHA-Materials/Maps Prep
> To: "Cape Hatteras Business Allies" <cahabusinessallies@embarqmail.com>
> Cc: allend@coastalnet.com, bobeakes@aginet.com, bsgould@msn.com, cameron@coastalnet.com, "Carla Boucher" <ccboucher@cox.net>, chra07@yahoo.com, "Cyndy Holda" <cyndy_holda@nps.gov>, "David Goodwin" <dagwerksobx@yahoo.com>, Darrell_Echols@nps.gov, davandme@embarqmail.com, david_rabon@fws.gov, "Destry Jarvis" <destryjarvis@earthlink.net>, ffffl@mindspring.com, hardhead@embarqmail.com, jim.keene@ncbba.org, jkeene@franklineq.com, "Jason Rylander" <jrylander@defenders.org>, "Ona Ferguson" <oferguson@cbuilding.org>, "Pat Field" <pfield@cbuilding.org>, "Robert Fisher" <rcf@fisherccs.com>, rcmheritage@mac.com, rettied@hotmail.com, "Sidney Maddock" <smaddock@audubon.org>, "Karen & Dwight Rettie" <tarwathie@clis.com>, Thayer_Broili@nps.gov, wgolder@audubon.org
> Date: Thursday, January 29, 2009, 10:10 AM
> 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

> 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 concensus. 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; ffffl@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; wgolde@audubon.org; 'Mike
> Murray'; 'Pat Field';
> 'Cyndy
> >Holda'; 'Ona Ferguson';
> >jkeene@franklineq.com; Darrell_Echols@nps.gov;
> >'Jason Rylander'; Thayer_Broilli@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;
> >>ffffl@mindspring.com; Destry Jarvis;
> davandme@embarqmail.com;
> >>bsgould@msn.com; allend@coastalnet.com;
> bobeakes@aginet.com;
> >>cahabusinessallies@embarqmail.com;
> camerons@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_Broilli@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 ;
> >>ffffl@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
> >
> >
> >>the County Administration Building in Manteo.
> Please let us know if you
> >>plan to attend.
> >>
> >>Robert and Pat
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >