

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave \*\*\*\*\* [mailto:Dave@bighammer.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2005 08:31 AM  
To: philip@virginiasystems.com  
Subject: Re: FW: VCDL Petition to amend reg. 2.4

Sent only to you:

I read several things into this.

1: I'd be willing to bet there was contact between Case / Hoffman.

2: Busy... you mean like... figuring out where to not let the commoners defend themselves.

3: Thoroughly considered - sounds like a recipe for 'perpetual review'.

4: 'before any action is taken'... The rule is unconstitutional on it's face.

I'm sure they're busy, and I'm still of the opinion that at least Mr. Hoffman is willing to work, but the machinations at DOI could have a significant watering down effect on any relaxing of the rule.

My bet is that my request wasn't acted upon with the same immediacy I'm used to because Mr. Case is "very low profile" government employee. Years ago, I worked on the Y2K problems at NIH. They had 1 single, solitary person to coordinate the entire mainframe hardware and software verification for EACH mainframe computer. They set up 1 logical partition to do this to be scheduled ONLY by this person. The only problem - his email box was full, his voice mail box was full, and he never answered his email. NOR could he be found in his office. We sent staff to his office 2 days / week for 3 weeks unannounced - called his number NON-STOP. - we even used CA OPS/MVS to call him on 15 minute intervals and issue a master console message if the call got answered (unhooked). All these were unsuccessful. At our general staff meeting with the gov't I sarcastically asked "has anybody actually met Tim(the guy) or proven his actual existence?" This meeting included a Branch director, 4 section chiefs and lots of staff. None of them had, but a few "knew someone" who had. Eventually, we got a section chief to take up our cause ( a GS 15, IIRC that's 2 stars on the lapelle ) He couldn't reach the guy either, and he was used to getting immediate response. He took us over there, and let Tim's boss know that we wanted to hear from him. Yesterday. He didn't get a response. We reminded him a few days later "let's go talk to Perry - the Center Chief". We did and within the hour, we had actually made phone contact with someone alleging to be this guy. Literally, it took over a month to get this guy to even acknowledge our existence. I'll bet Mr. Case is along this line...

I think that works in our favor. We can use this in communicating to our congressional allies that DOI is non responsive, and not taking this seriously unless DOI Upper Management is involved. It only takes one congressional member to call and say "I have a constituent who needs your cooperation".

I think that type of correspondence should only go to our direct allies, and from our group of involved activists

You, the other group heads, board(s) of directors, perhaps all the EM's maybe not all... it would need to be worded accurately, and get the congressman's office attention.

The other 'general' correspondence shouldn't use this but rather just push for the reform.

Dave

----- Original message -----

>Date: Wed, 30 Mar 2005 07:54:40 -0500

>From: <Paul\_Hoffman@ios.doi.gov>

>Subject: Re: FW: VCDL Petition to amend reg. 2.4

>To: "Dave \*\*\*\*\*" <dave@bighammer.net>,  
philip@virginiasystems.com

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>David

>

>I am continuing to work on this issue as time allows. Jerry Case will be working with me on this. I would ask for your continued patience as our workload is high and I want to be certain this issue is thoroughly considered before any action is taken.

>

>Thanks

>

>Paul Hoffman

>Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks

>Room 3156

>1849 C Street, NW

>Washington, D.C. 20240

>Voice 202-208-4416

>Cell 202-365-4533

>Fax 202-208-4684

>E-mail: paul\_hoffman@ios.doi.gov

>

>

>

> "Dave \*\*\*\*\*"

>

<dave@bighammer.n

>

et>

To

>

Paul

Hoffman/ASFW/OS/DOI@DOI

>

03/10/2005

12:14

cc

>

PM

>

Subject

>

FW: VCDL Petition to

amend reg.

>

2.4

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>Dear Mr. Hoffman,

>

> Mr. Van Cleave asked me if I could get a status on amending the 'Parks regulation 2.4 concerning weapons. We met on January 24 to discuss this. I apologize for bothering you with this, I know you're very busy. Would you be able to point Mr. Van Cleave in the right direction to get the information he wants?

>

>Thank you very much.

>

>David \*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Philip Van Cleave [mailto:philip@virginiasytems.com]

>Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2005 10:17 AM

>To: Dave \*\*\*\*\*

>Subject: RE: FW: VCDL Petition

>

>

>I called and talked to a few people at DOI, but was ultimately sent to Lawrence Fraisure. Mr. Fraisure said a new person has taken over the PRM area: Jerry Case. Fraisure said he would contact Case and give him my info. He also gave me his number (202) 208-4206. I have left several messages, but have heard nothing.

>

>All I want to do is to get the number assigned to the PRM

and be able to get its status for now.