

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		gray, jack	No
2	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OPBA	Hess, Anthony G	No
3	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
4	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Smith, Kenneth W	No
5	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		FOARD, TIM G	Yes
6	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Poirier, Joseph R	Yes
7	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	u.s.a.	burroughs, robert g	Yes
8	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crider, Ruth	No
9	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Human Freedom vs Piping Plover	Mattingly, Mike	No
10	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thorn, Adrian	No
11	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRA	Hall, Mark K	Yes
12	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ripa, Brian	Yes
13	3/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scearce, David N	No
14	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		louis, troy	Yes
15	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vining, Lynn S	Yes
16	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		besemann, klaus d	No
17	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA, OBPA,Cape Hatteras Anglers	Miller, Paul	Yes
18	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		burroughs, lee f	Yes
19	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
20	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shircliff, Robert	No
21	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shircliff, Robert	No
22	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eichinger, Edward G	No
23	3/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Charles E	Yes
24	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Munsey, William	Yes
25	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
26	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rennie, Scott	No
27	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Doerr-Martin, Kimberely	No
28	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blanks, Earl	Yes
29	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Currin, Benjamin M	Yes
30	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilkinson, Lori C	No
31	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Linsenbigler, Mike	Yes
32	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Kerekes, Ali	Yes
33	3/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harvey, James R	No
34	3/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keys, Janice A	Yes
35	3/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Palmer, Jack E	Yes
36	3/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
37	3/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCabe, Keith D	Yes
38	3/17/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Plunkett, Dawn	No
39	3/18/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Heiser, Richard W	No
40	3/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burroughs, Thomas	Yes
41	3/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Croy, Richard S	Yes
42	3/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sims, Brian S	No
43	3/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stout, Ken C	Yes
44	3/22/2010	No	Business	Orange Blossom Bakery & Cafe, Inc.	Pereira, Charles M	No
45	3/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Baum, Johnnie D	Yes
46	3/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Basilone, Joe J	Yes
47	3/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cosmi, Scott A	Yes
48	3/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Waldbaum, John B	Yes
49	3/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mayo, Lisa	Yes
50	3/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Chitwood, Linda H	Yes
51	3/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		riggs, richard m	No
52	3/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	ONEill, Tim J	Yes
53	3/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dawkins, Kevin	Yes

0008491

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
54	3/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Palazzolo, Brian	Yes
55	3/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hunsecker, Carol A	Yes
56	3/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Test, Convio	No
57	3/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	US Taxpayer	BlackwellUS, Bill	No
58	3/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwartz, Rodger w	No
59	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Chitwood, Linda H	Yes
60	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		martof, andrew b	No
61	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
62	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Savell, Alexis C	Yes
63	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Floyd, Jonathan A	No
64	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Harrell, Willard F	Yes
65	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		barley, brett	No
66	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Federal Aviation Administration	alexander, nicholas	Yes
67	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cronin, James J	No
68	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		carvajal, mike	Yes
69	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Baker, William J	Yes
70	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perez, Adam	No
71	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		allison, chuck	No
72	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shooter, Matt	No
73	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	PB Surf Club	Robson, Peter C	Yes
74	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Langston, Bob E	No
75	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		jarvis, kristen m	Yes
76	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, William	No
77	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, Matthew A	Yes
78	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wheeler, Ryan	Yes
79	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wheeler, Blair j	Yes
80	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Willis, Matthew T	Yes
81	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	humans	cunningham, paul j	Yes
82	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dexheimer, Kyle	Yes
83	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lupin, Chris D	Yes
84	4/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		D'Angelo, Louis	Yes
85	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Applegate, Tom	Yes
86	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Queen, Larry	Yes
87	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	ESA	Anthony, Jeffrey K	No
88	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		BANEZ, MICHAEL R	No
89	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		F, Jack	No
90	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Honaker, Ian	No
91	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		bassett, brian j	Yes
92	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Pete	Yes
93	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		fentress, matt	No
94	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		whalen, michael	No
95	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	The Human Fund	N/A, Danny	Yes
96	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	flagler college	garber, jeff	No
97	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
98	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holt, Shane	Yes
99	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Planet and lovers of the outer banks	Klimis, Jason N	Yes
100	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	VCU arts student	nye, david h	Yes
101	4/2/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Surflife	Towersey, Chad s	No
102	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		schweke, joe	Yes
103	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		schirmer, scott f	Yes
104	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, sean	No
105	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Chamberlain, Jason	Yes
106	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gruver, Marcus H	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
107	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Michael J	No
108	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		rowells, jason	Yes
109	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clancey, Paul S	Yes
110	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		CATRON, ANDREW D	Yes
111	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dixon, Richard	Yes
112	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fox, Brett	Yes
113	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Los Angeles Fathomiers and Mid Atlantic Longfin Freedivers	Albert, Kelsey	No
114	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Metcalf, Prescott W	No
115	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		De Lille Wright, Jadie R	No
116	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yerks, Dave	Yes
117	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Podolak, Robert	No
118	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weber, Robert A	No
119	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		hutchison, jack a	Yes
120	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
121	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Serpe, Sal j	Yes
122	4/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Warga, Dave J	Yes
123	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		redwanski, jason e	No
124	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		redwanski, jason e	No
125	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
126	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Individual	Allen, Ed	No
127	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mignogna, Robert g	Yes
128	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	American Citizen	Wolfe, Jacob W	Yes
129	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blair, Edward	No
130	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Baffey, Michael J	Yes
131	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Murphy, Dennis	Yes
132	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
133	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	USGBC	dills, clay c	Yes
134	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	USGBC	dills, clay c	Yes
135	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		murphy, dennis r	Yes
136	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
137	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Self	Burr, Chip	Yes
138	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ward, Ernest E	Yes
139	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Munden, Matt	Yes
140	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Chris	No
141	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ruppert, collin c	Yes
142	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lannon, Chad M	Yes
143	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
144	4/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Black, Andrew C	Yes
145	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	McElmurry, Nathan	Yes
146	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Santiago, Omar	No
147	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Via, Matthew S	Yes
148	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	GMU Economics	Hinkle, Mark	No
149	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		greer, david a	Yes
150	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lengyel, John M	No
151	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer Banks Beach Buggy Assoc.	N/A, N/A	Yes
152	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Ocean Academy, LLC	portillo, dylan j	Yes
153	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
154	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Bruce W	Yes
155	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Bruce W	Yes
156	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCarty, David T	No
157	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Chase	No
158	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	surfrider foundation	Whitley, Jack w	No
159	4/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	America, Land of the Free	Eggers, Scott	No

0008493

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
160	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilson Jr, Clyde R	No
161	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dawson, Scott D	Yes
162	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Meekins, Scott	No
163	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Ryan	Yes
164	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McLaughlin, Patrick	Yes
165	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, danielle	No
166	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jenkins, Pembroke N	No
167	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Acri, Mark J	No
168	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamrick, Rob	No
169	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lorek, Tony	Yes
170	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		dillon-dawson, carol	No
171	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		dillon-dawson, carol	No
172	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
173	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burns, Dave C	No
174	4/5/2010	No	Non-Governmental	the united world federation	awari, chamel	No
175	4/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Caldwell, Thomas M	No
176	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
177	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
178	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Hoyt, Roberto	No
179	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Coen, Jon	No
180	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Wyatt, Ralph E	Yes
181	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tucker, Dave J	Yes
182	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cravey, Suzanne	Yes
183	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Merten, Richard G	Yes
184	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Brien, Edward J	No
185	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sulcer, Carolyn	No
186	4/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Payton, Paul H	Yes
187	4/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vilardi, Sue D	No
188	4/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blankenship, Stuart W	No
189	4/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fortney, Clark	No
190	4/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	None	Broughton, Janet	No
191	4/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bartee, Luke	Yes
192	4/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bland, Stephen D	No
193	4/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hooten, Jeffrey D	Yes
194	4/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kashlak, Jennifer	Yes
195	4/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Campbell, Fred L	Yes
196	4/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Palmer, Bill	No
197	4/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		VanLear, Tondalaya	Yes
198	4/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hyman, Robert M	Yes
199	4/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
200	4/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Simmons, Ricky	Yes
201	4/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		hughes, Betsy R	Yes
202	4/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Convio Test	Test, Convio	Yes
203	4/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Convio Inc	Test, Convio	Yes
204	4/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Convio, Inc.	Test, Convio	Yes
205	4/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mead, Robert and Jean	Yes
206	4/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
207	4/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	California State Parks	Sayers, John S	No
208	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Matt	Yes
209	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weaver, Kim F	Yes
210	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	None	Gravelly, Harry	No
211	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer banks surfer	criswell, timothy d	Yes
212	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tolliver, Christopher A	Yes
213	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Vietnam Veteran	Willem, Gene A	Yes
214	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tidd, Michele	No
215	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Eliot	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
216	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		James, Freddy	No
217	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rimmer, April G	Yes
218	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bain, Roger	Yes
219	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Anderson, Jeff	Yes
220	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
221	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
222	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, D	No
223	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		S, J M	No
224	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lambert, Linda J	Yes
225	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Carwile, Richard D	Yes
226	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zehender, Bill K	Yes
227	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Robert	Yes
228	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Convio, Inc.	Test, Convio	Yes
229	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Prigioni, Robert	No
230	4/15/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CHAC	Cullen, Lawrence D	No
231	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leonard, Stanley S	Yes
232	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Gallo, Thomas S	Yes
233	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Convio, Inc.	Test, Convio	Yes
234	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Convio, Inc.	Test, Convio	Yes
235	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	McCarthy, Justin V	No
236	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Broder, Chad B	Yes
237	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	McCarthy, Justin V	No
238	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		avallone, michael	No
239	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Convio, Inc.	Poirier, Joseph	Yes
240	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
241	4/17/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
242	4/17/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mendieta, Vince	No
243	4/17/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weiner, Henry	No
244	4/18/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Carmosky, Leo J	No
245	4/18/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wade, Jason R	Yes
246	4/18/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		von Klein, Kristin D	Yes
247	4/18/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		von Klein, Kristin	Yes
248	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	retired/obpa	parenti, william r	No
249	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Benson, John O	No
250	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hipes, Melissa B	Yes
251	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Mary C	No
252	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Denice	Yes
253	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hanavan, Ernest P	Yes
254	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wheless, Karen S	No
255	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dowling, Dana D	No
256	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
257	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Guffey, Carolyn	No
258	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Midgett, Timothy W	No
259	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	no organization but it won't let you change answer	VanOver, Christine	No
260	3/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nieto, Sharon	No
261	3/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blevins, Danny	No
262	4/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, James	No
263	4/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Paxson, Robert and Rossana	No
264	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Paxson, Robert S	No
265	4/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCabe, Kevin	No
266	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		NORRELL, BILLY E	No
267	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kennedy, Andy p	Yes
268	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sanderson, Jaime L	No
269	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lail, Donna c	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
270	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cromer, Richard G	No
271	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cichon, G	Yes
272	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marquis, Patricia L	Yes
273	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ellis, Janet C	No
274	4/21/2010	No	Business	Lizzie's Lair, LLC	Ellis, Janet C	No
275	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ellis, Samuel S	No
276	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dawes, Sandra A	Yes
277	3/12/2010	No	State Government	NCDENR	Rynas, Stephen	No
278	3/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jordan, Lynn	No
279	4/6/2010	No	State Government	SHPO	Sandbeck, Peter	No
280	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
281	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		M., Peter	Yes
282	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA OBPA	Saunders, Ronald & Cecile	No
283	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	ncbba	Boutchyard, Sanford m	Yes
284	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shipman, Jeffery L	Yes
285	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McFarland, Doug	No
286	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Akright, John B	Yes
287	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Gallo, Thomas S	No
288	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Bayside Anglers Group	Singer, Allen M	No
289	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Caulfield, Kevin A	Yes
290	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon supporter	Saville, Sean	Yes
291	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mahan, Connie	Yes
292	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Merewood, Heather	Yes
293	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, Anni	Yes
294	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Herring, Elaine	Yes
295	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kerr, Timothy	Yes
296	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smyth, Joan	Yes
297	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Betty Gray	Yes
298	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fraytet, Jules	Yes
299	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Urban, Michelle	Yes
300	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rubino, Matthew	Yes
301	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duckworth, Ron	Yes
302	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aitchison, Anne	Yes
303	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Warfel, William J	No
304	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holz, Robert F	No
305	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pormann, John	Yes
306	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Joyner, Albert	Yes
307	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hass, Ann	Yes
308	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Santoliquido, Geoffrey	Yes
309	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Armstrong, Frances	Yes
310	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	ncbba	reed, thomas j	No
311	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Irvin, Wayne	Yes
312	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Melissa	Yes
313	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mooring, Cindy	Yes
314	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bearden, Joe	Yes
315	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blakely, Esther	Yes
316	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ferry, Darwin & Margaret	Yes
317	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stambaugh, Ruth	Yes
318	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Knight, Judy	Yes
319	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weston, Jerry	Yes
320	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frank, Harriette	Yes
321	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rittenmeyer, Pat	Yes
322	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Staska, Bruce	Yes
323	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stanback, Mark	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
324	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adkins, Julia	Yes
325	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keltz, Steven	Yes
326	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mauney, Debbie	Yes
327	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Levitt Roberts, Julie	Yes
328	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	James, Russell	Yes
329	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bridges, Mary	Yes
330	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mottern, Robert	Yes
331	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reynolds, Barbara	Yes
332	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scott, Margaret	Yes
333	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Campbell, Christina	Yes
334	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bailey, Marcia	Yes
335	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Cassandra	Yes
336	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gibson, Rose	Yes
337	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Knaack, Kevin T	No
338	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gray, Richard	Yes
339	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hauser, Edward	Yes
340	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Puryear, G Gray	Yes
341	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leary, Cecilia	Yes
342	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smoke, Henry	Yes
343	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Raprager, Margo	Yes
344	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buckner, Carolyn	Yes
345	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hochschild, R. George	Yes
346	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bagley, Gail	Yes
347	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	schindler, victoria	Yes
348	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Carol	Yes
349	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoback, Sandra	Yes
350	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Orchard Jr, Robert	Yes
351	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clark, Anne	Yes
352	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clark, Lorelee	Yes
353	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heeter, David	Yes
354	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morgan, Michael	Yes
355	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolk, Stanley	Yes
356	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Ruth	Yes
357	4/22/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wynn, Peggy	Yes
358	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ebner, Michael	Yes
359	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wohlrs, Larry	Yes
360	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nadler, Lisa	Yes
361	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wood, Margaret	Yes
362	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Ruth	Yes
363	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Gordon	Yes
364	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	shelton, sandra	Yes
365	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Apperson, Robert	Yes
366	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		saylor, nigel	No
367	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Skinner, Edwin	Yes
368	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	TEMPLE, GLENN A	Yes
369	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baker, Ann	Yes
370	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Melissa	Yes
371	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanders, Thomas	Yes
372	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moon, David	Yes
373	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	christen, frances	Yes
374	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Conner, Julie	Yes
375	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adriance, gesa	Yes
376	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fairey, William	Yes
377	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blomgren, Rebecca	Yes
378	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	taylor, toni	Yes
379	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wouk, Kari	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
380	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wolf, robert	Yes
381	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zenz, Roberta	Yes
382	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	davis, kim	Yes
383	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Paynter, Cary	Yes
384	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	crumpton, doug	Yes
385	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lumpkin, Lee	Yes
386	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	slyker, eleanor	Yes
387	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer Banks Anglers Club	Donahue, Pamela S	Yes
388	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clapp, Lewis	No
389	4/23/2010	No	Business	WSBOBX LLC	Burlew, William S	No
390	4/23/2010	Master (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frank, James	Yes
391	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	PUBLIC	CONLEY, PATRICIA	No
392	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Godsey, Ruth	Yes
393	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
394	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rohner, Laurie	Yes
395	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koss, Joyce	Yes
396	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baugher, Caron	Yes
397	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mock, Susan	Yes
398	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chalker, Mikki	Yes
399	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ribolla, Ellen	Yes
400	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adams, BG	Yes
401	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	finnelli, marilyn & tom	Yes
402	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stagliano, Bridgett	Yes
403	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Donald	Yes
404	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hillary, Shannon	Yes
405	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mason, barbara	Yes
406	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rogers, Dirk	Yes
407	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Soulas, Daniel	Yes
408	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sprehe, vsprehe@carolina.rr.com	Yes
409	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hannon, nathan	Yes
410	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schuyler, Jeffrey M	Yes
411	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	jacot, angie	Yes
412	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Theresa	Yes
413	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bohlmann, Arthur	Yes
414	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
415	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mutch, Mary	Yes
416	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kapusta, Deborah	Yes
417	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dunkleberger, David	Yes
418	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pantas, susanna	Yes
419	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hawkins, Paul	Yes
420	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoole, Alice	Yes
421	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dellinger, Robert	Yes
422	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aoyama, Patricia	Yes
423	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Palsha, Robert	Yes
424	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grant, ML	Yes
425	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ruffin, Sara	Yes
426	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hurt, Kimberly	Yes
427	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoole, Brunson	Yes
428	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shematek, Judith	Yes
429	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wolf, alan	Yes
430	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young, Ryan	Yes
431	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hopfenberg, Russell	Yes
432	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loyd, Joy	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
433	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lumpkin, Mike	Yes
434	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	heyden, matt	Yes
435	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lank, Hannah	Yes
436	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Provost, Ruth	Yes
437	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	casey, diane	Yes
438	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graziosa, Sara	Yes
439	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Herndon, Laura	Yes
440	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
441	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelsonpetit, Ross	Yes
442	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Collins, Carol	Yes
443	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Tschopp, Angela R	No
444	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ruch, Frederick H	Yes
445	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Trufan, Hal	Yes
446	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Scoville, Pam	No
447	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCurdy, David	No
448	4/23/2010	No	Business	sage.om	keller, deborah	No
449	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shelton, James	Yes
450	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
451	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McQuillin, Steven	No
452	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shelton, Ellen D	Yes
453	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mauney, Harry Ford	Yes
454	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lupton, Kent	Yes
455	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	harris, wendy	Yes
456	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hass, Marjorie	Yes
457	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Worgul Jr, George S	Yes
458	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Crouch, Oscar	No
459	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
460	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Long Island Beach Access Group	Tergesen, Ron J	No
461	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Garriga-Lopez, Adriana M	No
462	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mikell, David S	No
463	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hall, Silvia	Yes
464	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Szaz, Claire	Yes
465	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
466	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	IATSE	Prillaman, Dale N	Yes
467	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rawlins, Anna	No
468	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
469	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, lorelee	Yes
470	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Therault, Stephen	Yes
471	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tracy, Steven	Yes
472	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	esmas, ann	Yes
473	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bird, *	Yes
474	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nealis, Meg	Yes
475	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	surfrider	Riddle, Patrick F	Yes
476	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Messercola, Tracey	Yes
477	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
478	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
479	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
480	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Matthews, Ellie	No
481	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goodwin, Nancy	Yes
482	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Pierce, Jason A	Yes
483	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
484	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
485	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Edinger, Steve	Yes
486	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Watts, Elizabeth S	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
487	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Austin, Linda	Yes
488	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Villadonga, Charmaine	Yes
489	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Windmuller, Roy J	Yes
490	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
491	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		straub, gwen p	Yes
492	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reynolds, Peter	No
493	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
494	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neil, Steve	No
495	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goldstein, Jody	Yes
496	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Friedman, Valerie	Yes
497	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilson, Thomas	Yes
498	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rouhana, Alexander M	No
499	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ares, Michael	Yes
500	4/23/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, John B	No
501	4/23/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dambrosi, Anthony M	No
502	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D., s <del>o</del> verine	Yes
503	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Debbie	No
504	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Boone, Stefanie	Yes
505	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		MCGUINN, DEBORAH	No
506	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ahdoot, Samantha W	No
507	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jarzembowski, Astrid	Yes
508	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graybill, Rose	Yes
509	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	N/A, N/A	No
510	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Kraft, Stephen F	No
511	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider CLI Chapter	Jeno, Wayne	Yes
512	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		reinhold, kathy	Yes
513	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Walters, Amy E	Yes
514	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roman, Evan	Yes
515	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Barbara	No
516	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Koss, Kathy	Yes
517	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	NYS PEF	Stadnik, George	No
518	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Andenmatten, Aubrie T	Yes
519	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	LaRoche, Alan	Yes
520	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
521	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilhooley, Owen	Yes
522	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bruce, Carol	Yes
523	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hartsell, James	Yes
524	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGlone, Gail	Yes
525	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
526	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Buchsbaum, Mark	Yes
527	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pace, Freve	No
528	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Messina, Frank	Yes
529	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blanda, Joe	Yes
530	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Crawford O'Brien, Jana	No
531	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Walke, Jenifer B	No
532	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WILLIAMS, BARBARA A	Yes
533	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	brozovic, robert	Yes
534	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Purtill, Melissa L	Yes
535	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Hess, Anthony G	No
536	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Vaughn, Keith	No
537	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rossi, Rocco	Yes
538	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Newcomer, Barbara	Yes
539	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bachmann, John	Yes
540	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		P, R E	No
541	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parker, Bonnie L	Yes
542	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Magalis, Suzanne	Yes

0008500

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
543	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stuhaan, Sandy	Yes
544	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thomas, Bob	Yes
545	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		DeLiberio, Linda	No
546	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
547	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
548	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brimm, Martha	Yes
549	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	carbaugh, diane	Yes
550	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	ESA - SURFRIDER	POLLIN, LARRY S	Yes
551	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		layton, kermit I	No
552	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	BREITBACH, LOUIS	Yes
553	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hicks, Thomas	No
554	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Owens, Carly Clements	Yes
555	4/24/2010	Master (422554)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gibbons, Brian T	No
556	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Sullivan, Kinsey	Yes
557	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Valentine, Jennifer	Yes
558	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		justice, Cynthia P	No
559	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nixon, John R	No
560	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		West, Kevin	No
561	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kolter, Art	Yes
562	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	whitefield, anne	Yes
563	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garth, Ann	Yes
564	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
565	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bond, Karen	Yes
566	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Geahlen, Karen	Yes
567	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Amy	Yes
568	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Queen, Thomas	Yes
569	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blackwell, Vicki H	No
570	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Foster, Claudia	Yes
571	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
572	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	surfrider	slutsky, jordan b	Yes
573	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peterson, Robert S	No
574	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, John F	No
575	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sio, Carlos	Yes
576	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
577	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	French, leeann	Yes
578	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goff, Karen	Yes
579	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oliver, Patricia	Yes
580	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
581	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Allison Maas, Sara M	Yes
582	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rowlett, Kimberly	Yes
583	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nishioka, Joy	Yes
584	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Menkes, B	No
585	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Schacher, Curtis L	No
586	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kram, M.	Yes
587	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hinch, Dianne	Yes
588	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dow, Marie	Yes
589	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McAllister, Bud	Yes
590	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dennis, Gudrun	Yes
591	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Leyman, John	No
592	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hough, Andrew	No
593	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hinch, Judith	Yes
594	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, WALTER	No
595	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Frank, Harriete M	No
596	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schexnider, Lauren	Yes
597	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Heffron, Joshua P	No
598	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA, OBPA, CHAC	Gholson, Adam A	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
599	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Evans, Bob	Yes
600	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dunham, Katherine	Yes
601	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lyle, Peggy Nance	Yes
602	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Marsh, Dan P	No
603	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Skinner, Melanie	Yes
604	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clemmer, Anita	Yes
605	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Huson, Chris	No
606	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider member	Thomas, Kathryn A	Yes
607	4/24/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Catellier, Diane	Yes
608	4/24/2010	No	Non-Governmental	Cape Hatteras Secondary School Student Body	Dunnagan, Brad M	No
609	4/24/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Everett, Theresa	Yes
610	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gaber, Steven A	No
611	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	feder, melanie	Yes
612	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Criswell, Christina	Yes
613	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfriders	McCarthy, Michael H	Yes
614	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	McCarthy, Janet S	Yes
615	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Domurat, Meredith	Yes
616	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lenk, Alan	Yes
617	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boyer, Earl	Yes
618	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Flynn, Robert	Yes
619	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Larsen, Lewis F	No
620	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
621	4/25/2010	Master (422627)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Jacus, Anna J	Yes
622	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myers, Kelly	Yes
623	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parker, Sarah	Yes
624	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reese, Frankin	Yes
625	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Tim	Yes
626	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Haslett, Harry W	Yes
627	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Van Alyne, Emily	Yes
628	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cameron, Richard	No
629	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goodwin, Nancy	Yes
630	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation Delaware Chapter	Dombrowski, Melissa	Yes
631	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Teper, Shannon	Yes
632	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Butler, Jennifer D	Yes
633	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schoen, Chad	Yes
634	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cody Jr, Neal E	No
635	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cody Jr, Neal E	No
636	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
637	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baker, Susan	Yes
638	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chapman, Shawn	No
639	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ferguson, William C	Yes
640	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Finlayson, Ben	No
641	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Ken	Yes
642	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Picklesimer, Claudette	Yes
643	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition	Karson, Annabeth	No
644	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Figuroa, Julie	Yes
645	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lansing, Elizabeth	Yes
646	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finlayson, Donna	Yes
647	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goedsche, Charlotte	Yes
648	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider foundation	Henninger, Mike J	Yes
649	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pan, pinky jain	Yes
650	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cid, Michael	Yes
651	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leete, Susan	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
652	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Radke, William	Yes
653	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kobayashi, Anne	Yes
654	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
655	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Glazener, Jason	Yes
656	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rich, Steve	Yes
657	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Augustine, Lisa	Yes
658	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Amorosi, Joseph	No
659	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	My Family	allen, john r	Yes
660	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shitama, Celeste A	Yes
661	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelsen, Judith	Yes
662	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Private	callahan, Jared	No
663	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fox, Terrie M	Yes
664	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Curtis, Brian	No
665	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brewer, Beth	Yes
666	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Irwin, Mark	Yes
667	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		warren, teresa j	Yes
668	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rossi, Patricia	Yes
669	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Spitzer, Jason	No
670	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
671	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hildebrand, Linda	Yes
672	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thomas, Sara	Yes
673	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steininger, Robert	Yes
674	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Krawczyk, Greg	No
675	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	shoemaker, fred	Yes
676	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
677	4/25/2010	Yes (422853)	Unaffiliated Individual		leszcynski, kyra	Yes
678	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		leszcynski, kyra	Yes
679	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Jeff	No
680	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly, Sharon	Yes
681	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Delgado, Jerry E	Yes
682	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Floyd II, Eddie	Yes
683	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allen, Susan	Yes
684	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	coley Jr, kenneth	Yes
685	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Paulson, Kevin C	Yes
686	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Flannery, Linda	Yes
687	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Proenza, Lynn	Yes
688	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heath, Harrill	Yes
689	4/25/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cope, Dave	Yes
690	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kindel, Karen	Yes
691	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Knepper, Teresa	Yes
692	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jester, Lisa	Yes
693	4/25/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Berg, Ricardo U.	Yes
694	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	The Davis Family	Davis, William	Yes
695	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Antietam Valley Animal Hospital	Wagner, Briana F	No
696	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Warren, Carol	Yes
697	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cox, Howard S	Yes
698	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keiser, Robert	Yes
699	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Parker, Chris	Yes
700	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Michaelis, Adriane	Yes
701	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koschmeder, Teresa	Yes
702	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	American Institute of Architects	gregory, matt	Yes
703	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kilcomons, Patrick	No
704	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fripp, Archibald L	No
705	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Hatteras Realty Homeowner	Cantwell, Timothy J	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
706	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Cheryl	Yes
707	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Breitinger, Joe	Yes
708	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Sheridan, Scott M	No
709	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Natosha L	Yes
710	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Weber, John	Yes
711	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Dow, Justin	Yes
712	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	N/A, N/A	No
713	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Huggins, Margie	Yes
714	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Desjardins, Becky	Yes
715	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		McCossan, Terrence	Yes
716	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Grubbs, Lewis	Yes
717	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCSU	Hatcher, Dr Tim G	No
718	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robbins, Dave A	Yes
719	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
720	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rabon, Joyce	Yes
721	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Christie, Brandon N	No
722	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Couch, Sandra	Yes
723	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Whitlock, Ben	Yes
724	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loki, Reynard	Yes
725	4/26/2010	Yes (422767)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lang, Pete	No
726	4/26/2010	Master (422767)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lang, Monica	No
727	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stilwell, Bruce	Yes
728	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wolf, darlene	Yes
729	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richter, Rebecca	Yes
730	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Ann	Yes
731	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		dias, mara d	Yes
732	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Coastal Conservation Association	Clark, James T	Yes
733	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Newhard, Jim	No
734	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Montgomery, Jr., Robert F	Yes
735	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NJBBA, UMS, OBPA, Anglers Club	Finley, George b	No
736	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NJBBA, UMS, OBPA, Anglers Club	Finley, George b	No
737	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NJBBA, UMS, OBPA, Anglers Club	Finley, George b	No
738	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dawes, Karen M	Yes
739	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fox, Raymond G	No
740	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Antoon, Jay	No
741	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cynthia, Hichens W	No
742	4/26/2010	Master (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lizer, Deja	No
743	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		OConnell, Evan T	No
744	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jaworsky, Daniel	Yes
745	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ratcliff, Philip J	No
746	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Matheson, Sally L	Yes
747	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Myers, Steve	No
748	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grimes, Cindy	Yes
749	4/26/2010	Yes (422826)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lovell, Stewart	No
750	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Eastern Surfing Association	Robinson, Leanne F	No
751	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dwiggins, Chris	No
752	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schumacher, Amy	Yes
753	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Glovier, Jessie L	No
754	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	SURFRIDER	WOLFE, ANNA M	No
755	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spraggins, C	No
756	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Baker, Michael K	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
757	4/26/2010	Yes (422826)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lipsett, Skip	No
758	4/26/2010	Master (422826)	Unaffiliated Individual		McBride, Patti	Yes
759	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gill, Christopher G	No
760	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCann-Sayles, MeiLi	Yes
761	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCann-Sayles, Alan	Yes
762	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scher, Sarah	Yes
763	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nixon, Gregory L	No
764	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Schmuhl, Peter	Yes
765	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		bellerjeau, harriet	Yes
766	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cosaboom-FitzSimons, Mary and James	Yes
767	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cornelia, Jared	No
768	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cornelia, Jared	No
769	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schneider, Kathleen	No
770	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, John	Yes
771	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
772	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Atkinson, Eric	Yes
773	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	BN Design & Advertising	Nultemeier, Brent	No
774	4/26/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
775	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		cosby, charles c	No
776	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wood, Eugene	No
777	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Viernes, David & Jeannette	Yes
778	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Margeson, Lorraine	Yes
779	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clark, Lori	Yes
780	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sapp Jr, Henry C	Yes
781	4/26/2010	Yes (422853)	Unaffiliated Individual	CHNSRA regular visitor	leszczynski, leah	Yes
782	4/26/2010	Master (422853)	Unaffiliated Individual	CHNSRA regular visitor	leszczynski, leah	Yes
783	4/26/2010	Yes (422853)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mcsherry, Steven	Yes
784	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peterson, Linda	Yes
785	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Margeson, Don	Yes
786	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	carr, gaile	Yes
787	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tabor-Beck, Linda	Yes
788	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		crafts, charles	Yes
789	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walsh, Lucy	Yes
790	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pino, Cheryl P	Yes
791	4/26/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Terrell, Walter	Yes
792	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
793	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ciancio, Vincent h	Yes
794	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hegeman, Paula	Yes
795	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		west, randy	No
796	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davies, Amy	Yes
797	4/27/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual		leszczynski, randall m	Yes
798	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tyminski, Theresa	Yes
799	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Tom	Yes
800	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		murray, abigail	Yes
801	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thorson, Bradley D	Yes
802	4/27/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual		leszczynski, rita a	Yes
803	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyons, Jim	Yes
804	4/27/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Conover, John	No
805	4/27/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual		kolbert, alice a	Yes
806	4/27/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual		kolbert, nora a	Yes
807	4/27/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual	US citizen & park visitor	kolbert, nora a	Yes
808	4/27/2010	Yes (422899)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Marcus, Joyce	Yes
809	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	popcke, beverly	Yes
810	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Purkey, Jon G	No

0008505

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
811	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Purkey, Jon G	No
812	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	osborne, kendall	Yes
813	4/27/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual	regular park vacationer	vliet, ronald a	Yes
814	4/27/2010	Master (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual	regular park vacationer	vliet, laurie a	Yes
815	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoban, Ann	Yes
816	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Seward, Sonya M	Yes
817	4/27/2010	Master (422899)	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Melissa K	Yes
818	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schawang, Sandra E	No
819	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGlone, Colleen	Yes
820	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burke, Journey Home, Paul	Yes
821	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fruguglietti, Diana	Yes
822	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barker II, John D	No
823	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Altman, Kerry P	Yes
824	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Centex Kiteboarding Assoc.	West, Richard	No
825	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richards, Ph.D., Diana L	Yes
826	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudson, mark	Yes
827	4/27/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	C, Mike	Yes
828	4/27/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Starkey, Charles J	Yes
829	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schoof, Stephen	Yes
830	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Anderson, Tim	Yes
831	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
832	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moseley, Lynn	Yes
833	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barre, Carol	Yes
834	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacus, Anna	Yes
835	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rickenbach, Deborah	Yes
836	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cygan, Denise	Yes
837	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Deb	Yes
838	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nordsven, Ryan	Yes
839	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Armstrong, Nicole	Yes
840	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Levine, Sandy	Yes
841	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ponchot, susan	Yes
842	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morris, Gregg	Yes
843	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cranford, Beaufort	Yes
844	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siegrist, Toni	Yes
845	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dunnagan, Doug	Yes
846	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Love, Melody L	No
847	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barrett, David S	No
848	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	guecia, audra	Yes
849	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Poe, Deidre	Yes
850	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schoof, Leslie	Yes
851	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Gioielli, Lawrence	No
852	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rahmes, Robert	Yes
853	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alwood, Austin	Yes
854	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fleming, Lori	Yes
855	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
856	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
857	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
858	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
859	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
860	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
861	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
862	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
863	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hartig, Frank	Yes
864	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	siraco, adria	Yes
865	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cleereman, Helen	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
866	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Otterbourg, Richard N	Yes
867	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Fishing Fleet	Russell, Kenny N	No
868	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cosby jr, Charles c	No
869	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pond, Christopher	Yes
870	4/27/2010	Yes (422973)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kovach, Deborah K	No
871	4/27/2010	Yes (422973)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kovach, Bradley A	No
872	4/27/2010	Yes (422973)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kovach, Trevor A	No
873	4/27/2010	Master (422973)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kovach, Chelsea R	No
874	4/27/2010	Yes (422973)	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, LaCreause T	No
875	4/27/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Quinn, Patricia	Yes
876	4/27/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
877	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Lilliston, Greg	Yes
878	4/27/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	ORI	Harley, Genevieve	No
879	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koncsek, Elise	Yes
880	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tomins, Elmars J	No
881	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	anderson, harry w	Yes
882	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Windsor, Matt H	No
883	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoye, James M	No
884	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Combs, Steve C	Yes
885	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keto, Laurin A	Yes
886	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	Gordon, Greg	No
887	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stillman, Steve	Yes
888	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	self	austin, elwood r	No
889	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Wheless, Karen S	No
890	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hecker, Scott	Yes
891	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sholar, Jonathan D	No
892	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
893	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bridenbaker, Bruce v	Yes
894	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bautista, Heather	No
895	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sieren, Jeffrey	Yes
896	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Amy	No
897	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Babics, Dianne & William	Yes
898	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hile, Jason A	Yes
899	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Marcia K	Yes
900	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Fisher, Geoff	Yes
901	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nance, Chuck	Yes
902	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fitchett, Noel	Yes
903	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		bautista, robert e	Yes
904	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morgan, Patricia	Yes
905	4/28/2010	No	Business	Stevenson Uniform Ser Inc.	stevenson, marvin g	No
906	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Broekhoven, Mike P	Yes
907	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		tinyk, mike	Yes
908	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
909	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Geraci, Suzanne	Yes
910	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cox, Jason	No
911	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGee, Greg	Yes
912	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gugelberger, Rachel	Yes
913	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Southside Jeepers	Harris, William W	Yes
914	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ambrose, Jennifer	Yes
915	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		pittman, violetta	Yes
916	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Privat person	Bergdoll, Carina	Yes
917	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blumer, Elizabeth	Yes
918	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ballentine, Barbara	Yes
919	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Suzanne	Yes
920	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weber, Sandy	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
921	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mackin, William	Yes
922	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zinn, Robert	Yes
923	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
924	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scheinman, Dan	Yes
925	4/28/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Raper, Connie K	No
926	4/28/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Elliott, Lynn M	No
927	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DOBROTH, DALE	No
928	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Penen, Christian M	No
929	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Latz, Marianne	Yes
930	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Tracey	No
931	4/28/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Trudell, Heidi	Yes
932	4/28/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lytle, Denise	No
933	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Apperson, Robert	Yes
934	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bunton, Stuart	No
935	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Furman, Victor	Yes
936	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bua, Jimmy	No
937	4/29/2010	Master (423069)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barabas, James H	Yes
938	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brusadin, Teresa	Yes
939	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
940	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ratzenberger, Annette C	Yes
941	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marchand, Michael D	No
942	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morello, Phyl	Yes
943	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Chicago Kitesurfing	N/A, N/A	No
944	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hardman, Peggy	Yes
945	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	brooks, barbara	Yes
946	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		White, Edwin G	Yes
947	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Childs, Brendan P	Yes
948	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	L., Bert	Yes
949	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelley, Paul	Yes
950	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keating, Shawn T	Yes
951	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	DIFF	Young, David A	No
952	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Villate, Roberto	Yes
953	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelley, Paul	No
954	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		LaPrade, David A	Yes
955	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lamm, Kimberly L	No
956	4/29/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Henry, Mallika	Yes
957	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Banks III, George A	Yes
958	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	surf riders assoc.	keiser, peter	No
959	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sain, Dawn	Yes
960	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brandon, Lynn	Yes
961	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pratscher, Robert L	No
962	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Haines, Elaine	No
963	4/29/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Peterson, Jane	Yes
964	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Herz, Dayna	Yes
965	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rosenfeld, Cheryl	Yes
966	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adler, Fran	Yes
967	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Birnstengel, Robert	Yes
968	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sannes, Patty	Yes
969	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meyer, George	Yes
970	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wiencke, Katharine	Yes
971	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bibeault, jessie	Yes
972	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goltz, John	Yes
973	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pfadenhauer, Jeanne	Yes
974	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Denis, Laurie	Yes
975	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stack, Mary	Yes
976	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carney, Mary	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
977	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wallace, Jonathan	Yes
978	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frederick, Jamie	Yes
979	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Brooke	Yes
980	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnston, Ron	Yes
981	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hendrickson, Nancy	Yes
982	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elliott, Karen	Yes
983	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lux-Kosiewicz, Lynnea	Yes
984	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Letourneau, Paul	Yes
985	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kolbe, Gerald	Yes
986	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Godwin, Kim	Yes
987	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Price, Diane	Yes
988	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Winterrowd, Stephanie	Yes
989	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	George, Marvin	Yes
990	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dubinsky, Jeffrey	Yes
991	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Phillips, Noelle	Yes
992	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meacham, Lisa	Yes
993	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rizzo, Rosetta	Yes
994	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Brien, Aileen	Yes
995	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gibson, Scott	Yes
996	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myers, Frank	Yes
997	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carrigan, Maureen	Yes
998	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Felver, Rachel	Yes
999	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	el bekri, amal	Yes
1000	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Berger, Dian	Yes
1001	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thurmond, Roberta	Yes
1002	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGlathery, Davis	Yes
1003	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cassell, Lynn	Yes
1004	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Susan	Yes
1005	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Erica	Yes
1006	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sullivan, Teresa	Yes
1007	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oaks, Phoebe	Yes
1008	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stribling, Judith	Yes
1009	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Slonina, John	Yes
1010	4/29/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Holden, Dean E	No
1011	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Robert E	No
1012	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rauch, David L	No
1013	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holloman, Eric	Yes
1014	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hutchinson, Linda	Yes
1015	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rizzolo, James	Yes
1016	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Banik, Lisa	Yes
1017	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Horn, Katherine	Yes
1018	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bogan, Patricia	Yes
1019	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnstone, Gin	Yes
1020	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Florence	Yes
1021	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Risser, Sarah	Yes
1022	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tilton, Stephanie	Yes
1023	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Logan, Marilyn	Yes
1024	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carty, Claudia	Yes
1025	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jennings, Kerrie	Yes
1026	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Propen, B.	Yes
1027	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rodrian, Alicia	Yes
1028	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ozbenian, Serda	Yes
1029	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Healey, Jr., Tom	Yes
1030	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Starke, Stephen	Yes
1031	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Landau, Doug	Yes
1032	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Esteve, Gregory	Yes

0008509

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1033	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chiles, Pete	Yes
1034	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elsasser, Sue	Yes
1035	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cichock, Joseph	Yes
1036	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vega, Terri	Yes
1037	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Callaway, Susan	Yes
1038	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thoumi, Gabriel	Yes
1039	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Linn, Mary	Yes
1040	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Zant, S	Yes
1041	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Arkin, Don and Sharon	Yes
1042	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fischer, Elaine	Yes
1043	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williamson, Martha	Yes
1044	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	VrMeer, Janice	Yes
1045	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Watson, Laurel	Yes
1046	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Earle, Ben	Yes
1047	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saylor, Jack	Yes
1048	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McManus, Vicki	Yes
1049	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Collette, sharon	Yes
1050	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hellman, Elizabeth	Yes
1051	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fahy, Elizabeth	Yes
1052	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harrison, David	Yes
1053	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bishop, Susan	Yes
1054	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yaccino, Frank	Yes
1055	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ryan, Rebecca	Yes
1056	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McConoughey, Tamra	Yes
1057	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lepain, Andrea	Yes
1058	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simpson, Rusty	Yes
1059	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tate, Melanie	Yes
1060	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brooks, Paul	Yes
1061	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McKenna, Colleen	Yes
1062	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kitchen, Judy	Yes
1063	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hammes, Bud and Barbara	Yes
1064	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bedford, Theresa	Yes
1065	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chalfa, Matt	Yes
1066	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hudak, Tom	Yes
1067	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	moss, rhea	Yes
1068	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leixner, Lynda	Yes
1069	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cellette, Richard	Yes
1070	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beer, Alan	Yes
1071	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Matthews, Linda B	Yes
1072	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Theodore	Yes
1073	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Batt, Allen	Yes
1074	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bean, heather	Yes
1075	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Winn, John	Yes
1076	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Slade, Patti	Yes
1077	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pedersen, bruce	Yes
1078	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sullivan, Jacqueline	Yes
1079	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baumhauer, Richard	Yes
1080	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Putt, Monica	Yes
1081	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swick, Gregory	Yes
1082	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Workman, Mary	Yes
1083	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reid, John	Yes
1084	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rose, Mary Sue	Yes
1085	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heisserer, Louise	Yes
1086	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DUVIC, Maurice	Yes
1087	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Farinato, Sue	Yes

0008510

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1088	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burghart, Barbara	Yes
1089	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Waitkus, Brian	Yes
1090	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wait, cheryl	Yes
1091	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chilcoat, Denise	Yes
1092	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yokel, Bernard	Yes
1093	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bowling, Beverly	Yes
1094	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ARGANI, sholey	Yes
1095	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Neal, Elizabeth	Yes
1096	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Christensen, Rod & Rosemary	Yes
1097	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	gentry, sherri	Yes
1098	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kusmierski, Patricia	Yes
1099	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smart, Raymond	Yes
1100	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	klerer, leona	Yes
1101	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fleming, Laura	Yes
1102	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baker Gierlach, Marian and Peter	Yes
1103	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Valleau, Justin	Yes
1104	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williamson, Teresa	Yes
1105	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hayteas, David	Yes
1106	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Rebecca	Yes
1107	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Griffith, Tama	Yes
1108	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sizemore, Grant	Yes
1109	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mutterer, Sandra	Yes
1110	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rhodes, Linda	Yes
1111	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Lindsay	Yes
1112	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garbrick, Kathe	Yes
1113	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lenander, Karen	Yes
1114	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marlinghaus, Emilie	Yes
1115	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ritz, Marcia	Yes
1116	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richardson, Jennifer	Yes
1117	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fleck, Desiree	Yes
1118	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	TYSON, NATHAN	Yes
1119	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mipro, darleen	Yes
1120	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siddique, Omar	Yes
1121	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGowan, Louise	Yes
1122	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Jim	Yes
1123	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Langan, Marian	Yes
1124	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pusztai, Lupe	Yes
1125	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crawford, Donna Lee	Yes
1126	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	WolffWood, Jennifer	Yes
1127	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weber, Mark	Yes
1128	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Speer, Kirsten	Yes
1129	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Granton, Catherine	Yes
1130	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Jacob	Yes
1131	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stokes, Bill	Yes
1132	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sanlavun, sawatdee	Yes
1133	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Muscat, Juliette	Yes
1134	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mitchell, Charles	Yes
1135	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	taupin, estelle	Yes
1136	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gibson, Kelly	Yes
1137	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Petersen, Robert	Yes
1138	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swanson, Kristen	Yes
1139	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fowlie, BiLL	Yes
1140	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	russo, monica	Yes
1141	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cournoyer, Brian	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1142	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jenkins, Gil	Yes
1143	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Amundson, Beret	Yes
1144	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Whatley, Marsha	Yes
1145	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lajoie, Corinne	Yes
1146	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Cynthia	Yes
1147	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coates, Roz	Yes
1148	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pedersen, John	Yes
1149	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siegwald, Joan	Yes
1150	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wallace, Jennifer	Yes
1151	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Iverson, Dave	Yes
1152	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dragieff, Susan	Yes
1153	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moss, Mikasa	Yes
1154	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stankrauff, Alison	Yes
1155	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hedrick, john	Yes
1156	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	crowhurst, chris	Yes
1157	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Giese, Mark M	Yes
1158	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mowrer, craig	Yes
1159	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sheldon, Allen	Yes
1160	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harper-Smith, Pam	Yes
1161	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Handy, Dawn	Yes
1162	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Poss, Jane	Yes
1163	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hall, Howard	Yes
1164	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Erhart, Sarah	Yes
1165	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	smith, james	Yes
1166	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Justice, Ellen	Yes
1167	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lubin, Jan	Yes
1168	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peniche, Lori	Yes
1169	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	VanEaton, Treasa	Yes
1170	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Querubin, Antonio	Yes
1171	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dancer, Daniel	Yes
1172	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tipton, Bill	No
1173	4/29/2010	Yes (423069)	Unaffiliated Individual		Vornle, Nicholas	Yes
1174	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Proebsting, William	Yes
1175	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jezorek, Heather	Yes
1176	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilland, James	Yes
1177	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woodworth, James	Yes
1178	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoppe, Kenneth	Yes
1179	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly, Katherine	Yes
1180	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McLaughlin, Chris	Yes
1181	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Richard	Yes
1182	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jalbert, Diane	Yes
1183	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hefner, Patricia	Yes
1184	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Liotard, M	Yes
1185	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haigh, Sandra	Yes
1186	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Jennifer	Yes
1187	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cash, David	Yes
1188	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Falkenberry, Rebecca	Yes
1189	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gibson, Jody	Yes
1190	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Borom, John	Yes
1191	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Asbury, Craig Lee	Yes
1192	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mainelli, Margaret	Yes
1193	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drwinga, Helen	Yes
1194	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wales, carpathia	Yes
1195	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Devlin, Angela	Yes
1196	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vellios, George	Yes
1197	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wells, Jeff	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1198	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allen, Emily	Yes
1199	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Berkshire, David	Yes
1200	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Willett, Johanna	Yes
1201	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gosnell, Lisa	Yes
1202	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schaefer, Robert	Yes
1203	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robins, Jack	Yes
1204	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Remer, Mary	Yes
1205	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Augusta	Yes
1206	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rocker III, Charles	Yes
1207	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henson, Lana	Yes
1208	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cleversey, Barbara	Yes
1209	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Kellie	Yes
1210	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meyer, Colonel	Yes
1211	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frost, Linda	Yes
1212	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coble, Laura	Yes
1213	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Knowles, Linda	Yes
1214	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Antuna, Edma	Yes
1215	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seniawski, Charles	Yes
1216	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coad, Gertrude	Yes
1217	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Watson, Susan	Yes
1218	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Brien, Daniel	Yes
1219	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Digby, Jean	Yes
1220	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Caroline	Yes
1221	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Trejo, Trish	Yes
1222	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Callen, Janet	Yes
1223	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Samantha	Yes
1224	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lowe, Leslie	Yes
1225	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Margaret	Yes
1226	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Russick, Sharon	Yes
1227	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jackson, Irene	Yes
1228	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sas, Christy	Yes
1229	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacobson, Don	Yes
1230	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murphy, Frank	Yes
1231	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finn, Geri Pizzuto	Yes
1232	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holcomb, Sam	Yes
1233	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Byron, Doug	Yes
1234	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kolding, Shari	Yes
1235	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	YORK, GAY	Yes
1236	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Turner, Leslie	Yes
1237	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Flaniken, Cheryl	Yes
1238	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lee, Kathleen	Yes
1239	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gomez, Maria	Yes
1240	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gura, Joanne	Yes
1241	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sellers, Julian and Barbara	Yes
1242	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reineke, C D	Yes
1243	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeFord, Marion	Yes
1244	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schaedig, Terry	Yes
1245	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ritchie, Mary	Yes
1246	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graustein, Jean	Yes
1247	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scroggs, Myra	Yes
1248	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	YOUNG, Sally	Yes
1249	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grossman, Lois	Yes
1250	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nettestad, Chet	Yes
1251	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kahn, Dency	Yes
1252	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dennis, Gudrun	Yes

0008513

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1253	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McRae, Jane	Yes
1254	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Abrams, Rochelle	Yes
1255	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vazquez, Martha	Yes
1256	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gassman, Sara	Yes
1257	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jazzborne, September	Yes
1258	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wrinn, Chris	Yes
1259	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Harry	Yes
1260	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, John	Yes
1261	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adams, Roger	Yes
1262	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	audrey, schweikardt	Yes
1263	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Withers, Lynell	Yes
1264	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Laughlin, Nita	Yes
1265	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zaslow, Kenneth	Yes
1266	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fulkerson, Katherine	Yes
1267	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pierce, Brian	Yes
1268	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, Cynthia	Yes
1269	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gray, Roxy	Yes
1270	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hirshon, Maynard J	Yes
1271	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brose, Janice	Yes
1272	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rogewitz, Joseph & Linda	Yes
1273	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kees, Deb	Yes
1274	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drevenkar, Julie	Yes
1275	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Franchi, Irena	Yes
1276	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coppinger, June	Yes
1277	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Selquist, Donna	Yes
1278	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lahna, Joyce	Yes
1279	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reynolds, Cathy	Yes
1280	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kurland, Anthony	Yes
1281	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Borg, C.K.	Yes
1282	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crawford, Andra	Yes
1283	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hudson, Mike	Yes
1284	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clemenson, Janet	Yes
1285	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henning, Shari	Yes
1286	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Longmore, claudia	Yes
1287	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Environmental Learning Center, Spirit Creek	Yes
1288	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanders, Barbara	Yes
1289	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Franzen, Betty	Yes
1290	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	galli, william	Yes
1291	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Putnam, Lynn	Yes
1292	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wisz, Julie	Yes
1293	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Todd, David	Yes
1294	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lustig, Hermine	Yes
1295	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clifford, Deanna	Yes
1296	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greenwald, Cheryl	Yes
1297	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elliott, Marvin	Yes
1298	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	galitzine, judy	Yes
1299	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blevins, Laura	Yes
1300	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Waldo, Richard	Yes
1301	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, III, James R.	Yes
1302	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Traynor, Mary	Yes
1303	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lassberg, Colette	Yes
1304	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weaver, Jan	Yes
1305	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Piasecka, Ewa	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1306	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Godfrey, Eric and Ann Marie	Yes
1307	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tonkin, Gary	Yes
1308	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Willette, Thomas	Yes
1309	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Butler, Beverly	Yes
1310	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Canada, AM	Yes
1311	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vandevelde, Katrien	Yes
1312	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Proeger, Terry	Yes
1313	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tremblay-Costello, Robin	Yes
1314	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Norling, Jane	Yes
1315	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly, Wayne	Yes
1316	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hirt, Barbara	Yes
1317	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Neuser, Thomas	Yes
1318	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crosley, Christine	Yes
1319	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harper, William	Yes
1320	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Field, rebecca	Yes
1321	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	johnston, rex	Yes
1322	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Mark	Yes
1323	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kent, vk	Yes
1324	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kinkead, Sheila	Yes
1325	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zimmerman, Paulette	Yes
1326	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Valleau, Valerie	Yes
1327	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stockman, Stanley	Yes
1328	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fink, Russell	Yes
1329	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kirby, Liane	Yes
1330	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lipsky, thomas	Yes
1331	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Padgett, Melinda	Yes
1332	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Antuna, Martin	Yes
1333	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parnell, Francis	Yes
1334	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, lee g	Yes
1335	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rose, Pat	Yes
1336	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	George, Correne	Yes
1337	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burnett, Patty Jo	Yes
1338	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Frank G	No
1339	4/29/2010	No	Business	Teton Kiting LLC	Stacey, Will	No
1340	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ebner, Elizabeth	Yes
1341	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duey, Ann	Yes
1342	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mathias, Cathy	Yes
1343	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hines, Kathryn	Yes
1344	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wallace, Debbye	Yes
1345	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Abate, Alessandro	Yes
1346	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drinkhouse, Mary	Yes
1347	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sutherlin, Laurel	Yes
1348	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richert, Barbara	Yes
1349	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Neuendorf, Mary	Yes
1350	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mossbarger, Tina	Yes
1351	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martinez, Madelon	Yes
1352	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hall, John	Yes
1353	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graziosa, Anthony	Yes
1354	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eastman, ajax	Yes
1355	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thomson, Arran	Yes
1356	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Read, Campbell	Yes
1357	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeLaO, Jennifer	Yes
1358	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeGreenia, Rodney	Yes
1359	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bonney, Patty	Yes

0008515

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1360	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Berg, Deborah	Yes
1361	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walker, Joan	Yes
1362	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Landers, Gary	Yes
1363	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koloze, Kathy	Yes
1364	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ress, Thomas	Yes
1365	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wagner, Joanne	Yes
1366	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cohen, Claire	Yes
1367	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Huff, Alison	Yes
1368	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Culley, Kelia	Yes
1369	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sweeney, Alexa	Yes
1370	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roberts, Earl	Yes
1371	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Bradley A	Yes
1372	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rhodes, Louis	Yes
1373	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Begley, Christina	Yes
1374	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fredette, Katheryn	Yes
1375	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howard, L.	Yes
1376	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wetzel, Phyllis	Yes
1377	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howsley, Kimberly	Yes
1378	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Janiszewski, Cheryl	Yes
1379	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnston, Mary	Yes
1380	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beck, Diane	Yes
1381	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gibson, Lee	Yes
1382	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steele, Steven	Yes
1383	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DiFiore, Maria	Yes
1384	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	emond, gretchen	Yes
1385	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garnett, Janelle	Yes
1386	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Forrest, Terry	Yes
1387	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mullens, Troy	Yes
1388	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	WHITE, BRIAN	Yes
1389	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kurkowski, Cathy	Yes
1390	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nebel, Bob	Yes
1391	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meierdierks, Suzann	Yes
1392	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Charnquist, Heidi	Yes
1393	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Christian, Steven	Yes
1394	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stafford, Kevin	Yes
1395	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	navidad, susan	Yes
1396	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dickerson, Regina	Yes
1397	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shubert, Sharyn	Yes
1398	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hughes, Lee	Yes
1399	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Michel	Yes
1400	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Dominique	Yes
1401	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bogard, David	Yes
1402	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gillespie, Dair	Yes
1403	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Honigman, Wendy	Yes
1404	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pellissier, Meg	No
1405	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Luchs, Richard W	No
1406	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McMahan, Barbara	Yes
1407	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Osborn, Glendora	Yes
1408	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zandstra, Craig	Yes
1409	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Travis, Deborah	Yes
1410	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Behrends, Randy	Yes
1411	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kendrick, Missy	Yes
1412	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gunn, Angela	Yes
1413	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prall, Jane G.	Yes
1414	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ehlinger, Cynthia	Yes
1415	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ennis, Emily	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1416	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hagen, carole	Yes
1417	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hopkins, Amy	Yes
1418	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haagensen, Lynne	Yes
1419	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rosen, Judith	Yes
1420	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	fuqua, chad	Yes
1421	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reynolds, Pat	Yes
1422	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Butts, Wayne	Yes
1423	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Robert	Yes
1424	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Covington, Laurel	Yes
1425	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vaun, Sally	Yes
1426	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sexton, Mike	Yes
1427	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	fuqua, richard	Yes
1428	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kafity, Nizar	Yes
1429	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ferguson, Martine	Yes
1430	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lindqvist, Annika	Yes
1431	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, William	Yes
1432	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walsh, Molly	Yes
1433	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Toogood, Ed. and Josie	Yes
1434	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Caroline	Yes
1435	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lake, Jennifer	Yes
1436	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peterson, Joel	Yes
1437	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mosston, Leora	Yes
1438	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jobe, Laura	Yes
1439	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clarke, Virginia	Yes
1440	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stevenson, Nancy	Yes
1441	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	cohen, donna	Yes
1442	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Emmerich, Gerry	Yes
1443	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Deuell, Michael	Yes
1444	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rea, Bart	Yes
1445	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fraser, Mark	Yes
1446	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bennett, Bruce	Yes
1447	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lawless, Cheryl	Yes
1448	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Downs, Sharon	Yes
1449	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mullis, Diana	Yes
1450	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Brad	Yes
1451	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schlenoff, Debbie	Yes
1452	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ugglia, Donna	Yes
1453	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rehn, Debra	Yes
1454	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Christina	Yes
1455	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jennier, Jo-Ann	Yes
1456	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sweeney, gayle	Yes
1457	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	gamble, fairlee	Yes
1458	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chacon, Jesse	Yes
1459	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Teal, Mary Ann	Yes
1460	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Preevost, Virginia	Yes
1461	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Frank	No
1462	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Rourke, Lou	Yes
1463	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Phalen, Sue	Yes
1464	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nickl, Sharon	Yes
1465	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rocheleau, Jessica	Yes
1466	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richards, Lynda	Yes
1467	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Costa, Demelza	Yes
1468	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Norris, Shelby	Yes
1469	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sappelli, Carin	Yes
1470	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zimmerman, Cathy	Yes
1471	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smedley, S L	Yes

0008517

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1472	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Rodney	Yes
1473	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fonfa, Ann	Yes
1474	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ford, K. Hilary	Yes
1475	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wirth, Charles	Yes
1476	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Popp, Kelly	Yes
1477	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Matheson, Neill	Yes
1478	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bell, James	Yes
1479	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hudson, Gail	Yes
1480	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brighton, Ruth Anne	Yes
1481	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finlayson, Heather	Yes
1482	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Olah, Theresa	Yes
1483	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ferguson, Michael	Yes
1484	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crotty, Joh	Yes
1485	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Denniston, Glenda	Yes
1486	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDowell, Ed	Yes
1487	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strasser, Mary	Yes
1488	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sullivan, Gayle	Yes
1489	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Morton	Yes
1490	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGuire, Meredith	Yes
1491	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rosenthal, Esther	Yes
1492	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jakusz, Darlene	Yes
1493	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rysewyk, Ryan	Yes
1494	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bala, Vijay	Yes
1495	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bescript, Ruth	Yes
1496	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tranchant, Daniele	Yes
1497	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thompson, Eve	Yes
1498	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tolley, Mark	Yes
1499	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swift, Jesse	Yes
1500	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Russo, Meredith	Yes
1501	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Panemangalore, Myna	Yes
1502	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bickel, Bettina	Yes
1503	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yingling, Jacob T	No
1504	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clapp, Leslie	Yes
1505	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Lee	Yes
1506	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schenk, Susan	Yes
1507	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ganson, Charmaine	Yes
1508	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lagerman, Susan	Yes
1509	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shallman, Elsy	Yes
1510	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lynch, Jaremy	Yes
1511	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Shirley	Yes
1512	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caralla, Alyssa	Yes
1513	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zank, Benjamin	Yes
1514	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jared, Keely	Yes
1515	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bloomer, Jerry	Yes
1516	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richards, Allan	Yes
1517	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kirkwood, Anne	Yes
1518	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jessee, Judy	Yes
1519	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ballard, David L & Tami R	Yes
1520	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Melino, Linda	Yes
1521	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Craig, Kathy	Yes
1522	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tizard, Thomas	Yes
1523	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, Linda	Yes
1524	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jimenez, Marcelino	Yes
1525	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Earl	Yes
1526	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pehrson, Elizabeth	Yes

0008518

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1527	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ford, Melody	Yes
1528	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stradel-Graf, Julie	Yes
1529	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Angel, Beth	Yes
1530	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mace, Suzanne M.	Yes
1531	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gorman, Karen	Yes
1532	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wicce, Kunda Lee	Yes
1533	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drake, Don	Yes
1534	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Briggs, John	Yes
1535	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mattiello, Tricia	Yes
1536	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	metcalf, a	Yes
1537	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Herold, BH	Yes
1538	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Danielak, Valeska	Yes
1539	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sterling, Kurt	Yes
1540	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kitzman MD, Irene	Yes
1541	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Paul	Yes
1542	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reishus, Brenda	Yes
1543	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Norris, Cynthia	Yes
1544	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Inglis, Adrienne	Yes
1545	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Benton, Coralie	Yes
1546	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mc Gee, John	Yes
1547	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mauvais, Steven	Yes
1548	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	EDROSA, LORELEI	Yes
1549	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Royce, Lesley	Yes
1550	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swope, Natalie	Yes
1551	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	BERISH, KRISTA	Yes
1552	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Veaux, Carl	Yes
1553	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lerman, Karen	Yes
1554	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Plante, Marie	Yes
1555	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mendez-Gandara, Joan	Yes
1556	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haines, Kyle	Yes
1557	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Jeffrey	Yes
1558	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCain, Melanie	Yes
1559	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dobbs, James	Yes
1560	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	White, Lois	Yes
1561	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haas, Dan	Yes
1562	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grmoja, Ivana	Yes
1563	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Dawna	Yes
1564	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lincoln, Deborah	Yes
1565	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oldenburg, Elizabeth	Yes
1566	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kulina, Paula	Yes
1567	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nokkentved, Pam	Yes
1568	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Engelhart, Karen	Yes
1569	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parisi, Rita	Yes
1570	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Glenn	Yes
1571	4/29/2010	Yes (423069)	Unaffiliated Individual	Kitesurfing	Mercille, Jocelyne	Yes
1572	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hutchins, William	Yes
1573	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stoughton, Richard M	Yes
1574	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lampman, Marilee	Yes
1575	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacobson, Gail	Yes
1576	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howenstein, David	Yes
1577	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schuchard, Susan	Yes
1578	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prchal, Steve	Yes
1579	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prather, Lonnette	Yes
1580	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shimer, Sue	Yes
1581	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Trager, Jami	Yes
1582	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cribbs, Jan	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1583	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bowden, Tammy	Yes
1584	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mann, mary elizabeth	Yes
1585	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lorello, Donna	Yes
1586	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jennings, Ryan	Yes
1587	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Merritt, Mandy	Yes
1588	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bracken, Sarah	Yes
1589	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGonagill, Lynn	Yes
1590	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sutton, Brian K	Yes
1591	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holliday, Jody	Yes
1592	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pryor-Luzier, Maresa	Yes
1593	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanson, Annette	Yes
1594	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shrader, Kay	Yes
1595	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zepeda, Amelia	Yes
1596	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steinberg, Jack	Yes
1597	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	schaming, carol	Yes
1598	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bremer, Deb	Yes
1599	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mick, Peanut	Yes
1600	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haskell, Eric	Yes
1601	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heinen, Linda	Yes
1602	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miner, Joyce	Yes
1603	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hubbard, Dan	Yes
1604	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	flowers, betty	Yes
1605	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pritchard, Jeff	Yes
1606	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pfand, Alice	Yes
1607	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jordan, Rose	Yes
1608	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	morden, michael	Yes
1609	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
1610	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Noyes, Susan	Yes
1611	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brylski, Geraldine	Yes
1612	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boone, James	Yes
1613	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Houck, Alexandra	Yes
1614	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SPUNGIN, CLAUDIA	Yes
1615	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Nelson	Yes
1616	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Altobelli, Bruce	Yes
1617	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Betty	Yes
1618	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kemerer, Jane	Yes
1619	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wedel, Elizabeth	Yes
1620	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilde, Marika	Yes
1621	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Glickman, Margery	Yes
1622	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goings, Annette	Yes
1623	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tillmann, Winifred	Yes
1624	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	buelow, chris	Yes
1625	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richardson, Linda	Yes
1626	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	newell, heather	Yes
1627	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loayza, Sheila	Yes
1628	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hejl, Diane	Yes
1629	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sloane, Amanda	Yes
1630	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burns, Bruce	Yes
1631	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weinstock, David	Yes
1632	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	meredith, judy	Yes
1633	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hershey-Lear, Chandra	Yes
1634	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mirate, Jeffrey	Yes
1635	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kiser, Mark	Yes
1636	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Patterson, Carol Joan	Yes
1637	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Northrup, Amar Kaur	Yes
1638	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holt, Philetus	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1639	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Whittaker, Kara	Yes
1640	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hazard, Evan and Elaine	Yes
1641	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kisiel, Shannon F	Yes
1642	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wade, Kitty	Yes
1643	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	BIRCH, DOROTHY	Yes
1644	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garvey, Lydia	Yes
1645	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Luppi, Joanne	Yes
1646	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Larsen, Kim	Yes
1647	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McMillan, Sherrie	Yes
1648	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gotmer, Michael	Yes
1649	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hodsdon, Donna M.	Yes
1650	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beasley, Donna	Yes
1651	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goedhart, Hester	Yes
1652	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Panek, Jessie	Yes
1653	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pohlman, Cathy	Yes
1654	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Metivier, Jonathan	Yes
1655	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mory, Stephanie	Yes
1656	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duplissis, Eve	Yes
1657	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bell, Martha	Yes
1658	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Somers, Alan	Yes
1659	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henry, Jennifer	Yes
1660	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rundlett, Ardis	Yes
1661	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Behrend, Glen	Yes
1662	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MONTEZ, VINNIE	Yes
1663	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones-Morton, PhD, Pamela	Yes
1664	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gill, Gail	Yes
1665	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jackson, Jennifer	Yes
1666	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mullineaux, Dixie	Yes
1667	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tufford, Cindy	Yes
1668	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boltz, John and Connie	Yes
1669	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pierson, Sheryl	Yes
1670	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Charlene	Yes
1671	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Winter, Sandra	Yes
1672	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klay, Karen	Yes
1673	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rhoads, Kirk	Yes
1674	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Doucet, Lisha	Yes
1675	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lait, kay	Yes
1676	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cloutier, Janis	Yes
1677	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baxter, Paul	Yes
1678	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Molinaro, James	No
1679	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alexander, Valerian	Yes
1680	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clay, Metric	Yes
1681	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garcia, Sandy	Yes
1682	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chaffee, Pamela	Yes
1683	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wechsler, Susan	Yes
1684	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vann, Amber	Yes
1685	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shultz, Jamie	Yes
1686	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Emery, Melinda	Yes
1687	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schuhrke, Nancy	Yes
1688	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smallman, Denise	Yes
1689	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taraska, Sharon	Yes
1690	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bridwell, Jack	Yes
1691	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bacon, Twyla	Yes
1692	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	searle, suzanne	Yes
1693	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brunner, David	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1694	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mason, tom	Yes
1695	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Popp, Cathy	Yes
1696	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parfitt, John	Yes
1697	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allgood, Jean	Yes
1698	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	El Masri, Judy	Yes
1699	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	LaCognata, Dale	Yes
1700	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carson, Andrew	Yes
1701	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weinrich, John	Yes
1702	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zentarski, Joan	Yes
1703	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fissel, Peter	Yes
1704	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stanley, Richard	Yes
1705	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kosa, Nancy	Yes
1706	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roulston-Doty, Suzanne	Yes
1707	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brayton, Alfred	Yes
1708	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strousberg, Cindy	Yes
1709	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gray, Jack	Yes
1710	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hauschild, Carol	Yes
1711	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Secviar, Jon	Yes
1712	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rivera, Mario	Yes
1713	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Larsen, Richard	Yes
1714	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cleave, Jane and Frank	Yes
1715	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shimmel, Martin	Yes
1716	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Churchill, Josephine	Yes
1717	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Konze, Virginia	Yes
1718	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Skidmore, Elliott	Yes
1719	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grimes, Garry	Yes
1720	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weiland, Sherry	Yes
1721	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	rohde, Patricia	Yes
1722	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Naumann, Lori	Yes
1723	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Austin, Elizabeth	Yes
1724	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prefontaine, Joan	Yes
1725	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lacognata, Dale	Yes
1726	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Collins, Barbara	Yes
1727	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tomoff, Carl	Yes
1728	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prager, Christine	Yes
1729	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Dale	Yes
1730	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keen, Sharon	Yes
1731	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	HUEBNER, Herb	Yes
1732	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robertson-Lorant, Laurie	Yes
1733	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oslund, Stanley	Yes
1734	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nesmith, June	Yes
1735	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robertson, Barbara and Lar	Yes
1736	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	page, jerina	Yes
1737	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	flores, Maria	Yes
1738	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Claypool, Roberta	Yes
1739	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Atwell, Judith	Yes
1740	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, William	Yes
1741	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meadow, Karen	Yes
1742	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chard, John	Yes
1743	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marks, Jeremy Nathan	Yes
1744	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kane, Eileen	Yes
1745	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strozier, Robby	Yes
1746	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haseleu, Judith	Yes
1747	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacobs, Naomi	Yes
1748	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Champagne, Jenette	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1749	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chapman, Ann	Yes
1750	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fuller, Shauna	Yes
1751	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reese, William	Yes
1752	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aylard, Adrianna	Yes
1753	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bescript, Linda	Yes
1754	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lundahl, Tim	Yes
1755	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Everett, David	Yes
1756	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kovalck, Charles	Yes
1757	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brum, Morris	Yes
1758	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ridge, Mary	Yes
1759	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kornstein, Nina	Yes
1760	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Webb, Kenneth	Yes
1761	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zuckerman, Bonnie	Yes
1762	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peck, Linda	Yes
1763	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gathing, Nancy	Yes
1764	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Normand, Robert	Yes
1765	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wiest, jo	Yes
1766	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDonald, Logan	Yes
1767	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bartlett, Mary	Yes
1768	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	A, Patricia	Yes
1769	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bruins, O. William	Yes
1770	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jeffery, Matthew	Yes
1771	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Paulson, Russ	Yes
1772	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Silver, Barbara	Yes
1773	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rivera, Miguel Jean	Yes
1774	4/29/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Wolfe, Robert	Yes
1775	4/29/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Drew	No
1776	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Frank	Yes
1777	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Margaret	Yes
1778	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Babiak, Katherine	Yes
1779	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wiggers, Stewart	Yes
1780	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myers, David	Yes
1781	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rose, Bill	Yes
1782	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kirchner, John	Yes
1783	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Packard, Nancy	Yes
1784	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dugan, Jim	Yes
1785	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morseth, Wendy	Yes
1786	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sabo, George & Colleen	Yes
1787	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Skaar, Pamela	Yes
1788	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Snyder, Cindy	Yes
1789	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carbiener, Karen	Yes
1790	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Branch, Deborah	Yes
1791	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burawski, Michelle	Yes
1792	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lopez, Maxine	Yes
1793	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goenner, Emily	Yes
1794	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Witzeman, Robert	Yes
1795	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Michael	Yes
1796	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rose, Jan	Yes
1797	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Newman, Ricki	Yes
1798	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caldwell, M.E.	Yes
1799	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mogan, Jewel	Yes
1800	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fagnoli, John	Yes
1801	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sadowski, Joan	Yes
1802	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donato, Heather	Yes
1803	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buckley, John	Yes

0008523

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1804	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hunter, Aurora	Yes
1805	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Trail, Pepper	Yes
1806	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moon, Suzanne	Yes
1807	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Levy, Robert	Yes
1808	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vandehey, Roberta	Yes
1809	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Terbot, Lee & Charlotte	Yes
1810	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pease, Linda	Yes
1811	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	crump, brenda	Yes
1812	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dailey, Christa	Yes
1813	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wagner, Jacquie	Yes
1814	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Theriot, Colleen	Yes
1815	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dymkowski, Evelyn	Yes
1816	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SCOTT, sally	Yes
1817	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Horlick, Susan	Yes
1818	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blount, Karrie	Yes
1819	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	herrmann, ulrich	Yes
1820	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kaufman, Jane	Yes
1821	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Westerman, Gale	Yes
1822	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kruse, Mary Ann	Yes
1823	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Javinsky, Elizabeth	Yes
1824	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Semock, Richard	Yes
1825	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Lynn	Yes
1826	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Soulios, Alexis	Yes
1827	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hopkins, David	Yes
1828	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kazlouskas-Noyes, Gwen	Yes
1829	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lysell, Donald K	No
1830	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	New, Robert	Yes
1831	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bates, James	Yes
1832	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Avital, Cecile	Yes
1833	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, Kirstin	Yes
1834	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grey, Valerie	Yes
1835	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schmidt, Sara	Yes
1836	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gwinn, Jess	Yes
1837	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	James, Phil	Yes
1838	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marks, Elise	Yes
1839	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D, P	Yes
1840	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goldenberg, Helen	Yes
1841	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sedwick, Mary	Yes
1842	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mendelson, Ruth	Yes
1843	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rozsics, Mick	Yes
1844	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dooney, Meghan	Yes
1845	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Farley, Keith	Yes
1846	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grinavic, Tierney	Yes
1847	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steitz, Jim	Yes
1848	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Kathleen	Yes
1849	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aber, Thomas	Yes
1850	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parker, David	Yes
1851	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Carolyn	Yes
1852	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Neary, Michael	Yes
1853	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dennerlein, Catherine Bucky	Yes
1854	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Faith-Smith, Bonnie	Yes
1855	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Leslie	Yes
1856	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jolly, Sandra	Yes
1857	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bartlett, Charles	Yes

0008524

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1858	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fray, Antje	Yes
1859	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scheidt, James	Yes
1860	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bohmann, jerry	Yes
1861	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Botkins, Rodman	Yes
1862	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cucuzza, Drew	Yes
1863	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ginossar, Eran	Yes
1864	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lynch, laura	Yes
1865	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marsh, Susan	Yes
1866	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finn, Mark	Yes
1867	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kegley, Phyllis	Yes
1868	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hammond, Stephanie	Yes
1869	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bialeck, Darlene	Yes
1870	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Golden, Tim	Yes
1871	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aikman, Christina	Yes
1872	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alexander, Charles	Yes
1873	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Amy	Yes
1874	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Archev, Sheri	Yes
1875	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, David	Yes
1876	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kabay, Kristin	Yes
1877	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peckham, Theresa	Yes
1878	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lyman, Jen	Yes
1879	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Tina	Yes
1880	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goodman, Gretchen	Yes
1881	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	RAVENSTEIN, KATE	Yes
1882	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sebesta, Doyle	Yes
1883	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Belachew, Daniel	Yes
1884	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Surve, Triptaa	Yes
1885	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	stevens, donald	Yes
1886	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boynton, Lisa	Yes
1887	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	rossenu, stephanie	Yes
1888	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	grantham, danny	Yes
1889	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stoltenberg, John and Martha	Yes
1890	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McLeod, Matt	Yes
1891	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bennett, Virginia	Yes
1892	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bardsley, Alta	Yes
1893	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rozner, Jay	Yes
1894	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Majdan, John S.	Yes
1895	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ozkan, dogan	Yes
1896	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Hoose, Carole	Yes
1897	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Akin, Rose	Yes
1898	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGonigle, Brian	Yes
1899	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buono, Domenico	Yes
1900	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donston, Kacey	Yes
1901	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cuadra, jennifer	Yes
1902	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hadden Jr, W. James	Yes
1903	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Estes, Sherrie	Yes
1904	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drennan, Susan	Yes
1905	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	HAASE, THOMAS	Yes
1906	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ryland, Barbara	Yes
1907	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sensenig, trinidad	Yes
1908	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stevenson, Gloria	Yes
1909	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McKee, Laura	Yes
1910	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dolleans, Daniale	Yes
1911	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sayre, April	Yes
1912	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	housman, ruth	Yes

0008525

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1913	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bright, Ted T	Yes
1914	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clay, Bruce	Yes
1915	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schoedler, Randolph	Yes
1916	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robinson, Janet	Yes
1917	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Belanger, Marcy	Yes
1918	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elam, Susan	Yes
1919	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pate, nathan	Yes
1920	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Karns, Matthew	Yes
1921	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haskell, Michael	Yes
1922	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	forster, lynn	Yes
1923	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Toppen, MJ	Yes
1924	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meinhold, Mary	Yes
1925	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vice, Daniel	Yes
1926	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woodward, Mary	Yes
1927	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cronin, Tara	Yes
1928	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Menichino, Deborah	Yes
1929	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pintilie, Elena	Yes
1930	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fitzgerald, Robert	Yes
1931	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schwarz, Walter	Yes
1932	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edwards, Marilyn	Yes
1933	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	carl, erika	Yes
1934	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	campbell, nora	Yes
1935	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dempsey, Kathleen	Yes
1936	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spahn, Debbie	Yes
1937	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Black, Steve	Yes
1938	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, Ken	Yes
1939	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	de Bie, Fiep	Yes
1940	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Batson, Jon	Yes
1941	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ehrllich, susan	Yes
1942	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eckert, Amy	Yes
1943	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Philo, Evan	Yes
1944	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stenard, Amy G.	Yes
1945	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barcikowski, Tanya	Yes
1946	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gray, Leda Beth	Yes
1947	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Farrell, Luke	Yes
1948	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saunders, Jamie	Yes
1949	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	coffey, lisa	Yes
1950	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nordstrom, Carl	Yes
1951	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Herman, Randal	Yes
1952	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greene, Wayne	Yes
1953	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stanley, Laurel	Yes
1954	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bromer, Peter	Yes
1955	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Carol	Yes
1956	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Farmer, Thomas D	Yes
1957	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	cline, susan	Yes
1958	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bergum, Leslie	Yes
1959	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones RNLMT, Rachel	Yes
1960	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garvey, Jenna	Yes
1961	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hanley, robbi	Yes
1962	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wiley, Ann	Yes
1963	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Herbert, Joanathan	Yes
1964	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allison, Gail	Yes
1965	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reeves, Robert	Yes
1966	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Meacham, William C	No
1967	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yelin, Samantha	Yes
1968	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jenkins, David A	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
1969	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schuster, Tammy	Yes
1970	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vournakis, Karen A.	Yes
1971	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eve, Tracy	Yes
1972	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lotus, Emma	Yes
1973	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ford, Robert	Yes
1974	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Wert, Roger	Yes
1975	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bernardo, Kathleen	Yes
1976	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	tiller, anita	Yes
1977	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coiner, Diane	Yes
1978	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	VESSICCHIO, SUSAN P.	Yes
1979	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edmunds, Carolyn	Yes
1980	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dorr, Laurel	Yes
1981	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sleeper, Stephen	Yes
1982	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lindsey, Judi	Yes
1983	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buckingham, Irene	Yes
1984	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cock, Christine	Yes
1985	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Humphrey, Carol	Yes
1986	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Perez-Watkins, Monica	Yes
1987	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bednaz, Noel	Yes
1988	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
1989	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
1990	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
1991	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MacLellan, Eleanor	Yes
1992	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tallant, Deenie	Yes
1993	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moye, Joe	Yes
1994	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanson, Delene	Yes
1995	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Braatz, Amber	Yes
1996	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finelli, Katherine	Yes
1997	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zurcher, Christopher	Yes
1998	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mastri, Francis	Yes
1999	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saunders, Sherry	Yes
2000	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klahorst, Wanda	Yes
2001	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greenwald, Judy	Yes
2002	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spurr, Elaine	Yes
2003	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Mabel	Yes
2004	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Becker, Jennifer	Yes
2005	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mielnikiewicz, Ziggy	Yes
2006	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Farmer, Thomas D	No
2007	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Thomas	Yes
2008	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Liedlich, Nancy	Yes
2009	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Egleston, Ann	Yes
2010	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Santos, Saskia	Yes
2011	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seekamp, Angie	Yes
2012	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seaver, Harmon	Yes
2013	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Perenich, Theresa	Yes
2014	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pedigo, Pat	Yes
2015	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nichols, Carmen	Yes
2016	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	harmon, debbie	Yes
2017	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loesch-Fries, Sue	Yes
2018	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dilworth, R.	Yes
2019	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parker, Douglas	Yes
2020	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parrett, David	Yes
2021	4/30/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	kelly, brad	Yes
2022	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Collins, Joe	Yes
2023	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drache, Kay	Yes
2024	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SMITH, KEITH	Yes

0008527

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2025	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marshall, Rebecca	Yes
2026	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bubel, Sharon	Yes
2027	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Judith	Yes
2028	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Daly, Margaret	Yes
2029	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leatto, Renne	Yes
2030	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Faulk, Don and Joyce	Yes
2031	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eikner-Austin, Emily	Yes
2032	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grigsby, Lori	Yes
2033	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walker, Larry	Yes
2034	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hildebrandt, Todd	Yes
2035	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	rohrig, eric	Yes
2036	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meyer, Tara	Yes
2037	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hearne, Barbara	Yes
2038	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cook, Lori	Yes
2039	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Porter, Julie	Yes
2040	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Trump, Leon	Yes
2041	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mills, Amy	Yes
2042	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Galbreath, Mary Jean	Yes
2043	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rutledge, Brian	Yes
2044	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Latham, Judith C	No
2045	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lund, Lisa	Yes
2046	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stockdale-Homick, Renee	Yes
2047	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	rolfe, georgia	Yes
2048	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kitchens, Allegra	Yes
2049	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bilodeau, Bill	Yes
2050	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bland, brian	Yes
2051	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shebesta, Robert	Yes
2052	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wicker, R David	Yes
2053	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prather, Wendy	Yes
2054	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Salts, Carey	Yes
2055	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ward, Mary	Yes
2056	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nuti, Kenneth	Yes
2057	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Larry	Yes
2058	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	NEIMA, neima	Yes
2059	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davies-Sigmund, Steven	Yes
2060	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gallagher, Frances	Yes
2061	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Huddle, Julie	Yes
2062	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bennett, VIRGINIA	Yes
2063	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dehlin, Darlene	Yes
2064	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tsouvalas, Alex	Yes
2065	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pihl, Stephanie H	Yes
2066	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Winstead, Nicholas	Yes
2067	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	roberts, sybil	Yes
2068	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burroughs, Karen	Yes
2069	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hooper, Jean	Yes
2070	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	edmiston, kavita	Yes
2071	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leaf, Sue	Yes
2072	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schlegel, Laura	Yes
2073	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mitchell, Joanne	Yes
2074	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Major, Roy F.	Yes
2075	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fernandez, John	Yes
2076	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elliott, Paula	Yes
2077	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cairns, Kelly	Yes
2078	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Macfarlane, Linda	Yes
2079	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bellefontaine, Julia	Yes
2080	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGowan, Wendy	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2081	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mccurdy, Dassi	Yes
2082	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Andersson, Amena	Yes
2083	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kaur, Mininder	Yes
2084	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beardsley, Rebecca	Yes
2085	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bellenger, Anne	Yes
2086	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Rhiannon	Yes
2087	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Perkins, Joel	Yes
2088	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Logsdon, Angel	Yes
2089	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dyer, Lori	Yes
2090	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brundage, Joan	Yes
2091	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sniderman, Sonia	Yes
2092	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shell, Jeminie	Yes
2093	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Balfour, Michele	Yes
2094	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeVos-Jaggs, Eva	Yes
2095	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ruscoe, Dean	Yes
2096	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nazor, Craig	Yes
2097	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Horvath, William	Yes
2098	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Probyn, Lucy	Yes
2099	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chance, Chelsea	Yes
2100	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hansen, Loren	Yes
2101	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ward, Anita	Yes
2102	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mauropoulou, Afrodith	Yes
2103	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bonk, Vicki	Yes
2104	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Karnofsky, William	Yes
2105	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	inskeep, susan	Yes
2106	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Olson, Dara	Yes
2107	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rogers, James	Yes
2108	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Diggle, Gloria	Yes
2109	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	vinsanau, karen	Yes
2110	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Castigliero, Elizabeth	Yes
2111	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Snitzer, Eileen	Yes
2112	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGowan, Joan	Yes
2113	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fusaro, Amelia	Yes
2114	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Hilarie	Yes
2115	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MacArtor, Lorraine	Yes
2116	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wagener, Cheryl	Yes
2117	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Head, Garland	Yes
2118	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moulton, Daniel	Yes
2119	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rudio, Barbara	Yes
2120	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelley, Roberta	Yes
2121	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miles, Toni	Yes
2122	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dibble, Terence	Yes
2123	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Halizak, Kimberly Anne	Yes
2124	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Monroe, Molly	Yes
2125	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Triplett, Tia	Yes
2126	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hall, Robert	Yes
2127	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tyburski, Kim	Yes
2128	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donofrio, Deborah	Yes
2129	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wylde, Isabella	Yes
2130	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hafer, Sarah	Yes
2131	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	blaise, sharlane	Yes
2132	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	riehart, dale	Yes
2133	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McKinney, Trenton	Yes
2134	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young, Jo Ellen	Yes
2135	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gonzalez, William G.	Yes
2136	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Riley, Kelly	Yes

0008529

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2137	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lambe, Susan	Yes
2138	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Larivey Jr, Dan	Yes
2139	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wood, Don	Yes
2140	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howe, Linda	Yes
2141	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schroeder, Sara	Yes
2142	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ryan, laurie	Yes
2143	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mick, Rusty	Yes
2144	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simon, Karen	Yes
2145	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Avila, Ron	Yes
2146	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Macdonald, Cecily	Yes
2147	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Niday, Donald	Yes
2148	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Black, Angela	Yes
2149	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Durand, Lucia	Yes
2150	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sandman, Dan	Yes
2151	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Colasurdo, Christine	Yes
2152	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Landa, Martin	Yes
2153	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCreary, Jan	Yes
2154	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGill, Ron	Yes
2155	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	BETANCUR, MARIA	Yes
2156	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jansen, Barbara	Yes
2157	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Zyl, Cynthia	Yes
2158	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolfe, Melanie	Yes
2159	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DiSabatino, Steven A	Yes
2160	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cornelia, Jared	Yes
2161	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hopkins, jeff	Yes
2162	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	schumacher, Carol	Yes
2163	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MacLean, Audrey	Yes
2164	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scholten, Suzanne	Yes
2165	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	walters, sandy	Yes
2166	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strickler, Zachary	Yes
2167	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howard, Fran	Yes
2168	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brewer, Grace	Yes
2169	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Boyd, James E	Yes
2170	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooper II, Gary D	No
2171	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooper, Laure A	No
2172	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooper, Margaret A	No
2173	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sommie, Lee	Yes
2174	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Friel, Jacqueline	Yes
2175	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rubin, Joan	Yes
2176	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Neiger, Vivian	Yes
2177	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bauman, Deane	Yes
2178	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Godwin, Kim	Yes
2179	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Lyrusa	Yes
2180	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DAnna, Marie	Yes
2181	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Bette	Yes
2182	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beisigl, Richard	Yes
2183	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Szostak, Alina	Yes
2184	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lasage, Clearysage	Yes
2185	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Corriere, Caryn	Yes
2186	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grover, Ravi	Yes
2187	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kanes, Panos	Yes
2188	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	andrews, matt	Yes
2189	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coberly, Laurel	Yes
2190	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finlay-Kochanowski, Jeannie	Yes
2191	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Day, Theresa	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2192	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gaede, Marnie	Yes
2193	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hortaridis, Stacy	Yes
2194	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SMITH, KAREN	Yes
2195	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burks, Phyllis	Yes
2196	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myers, Debra	Yes
2197	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Sarah	Yes
2198	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spears, Harvey	Yes
2199	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kaneko, Sylvia	Yes
2200	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leibowitz, Ruth	Yes
2201	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fischer, Marilyn	Yes
2202	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly, Alice	Yes
2203	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		blum, joseph	No
2204	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nam, S	Yes
2205	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Larson, Karla	Yes
2206	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cosmas, Thomas	Yes
2207	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	florence, jozon	Yes
2208	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kane, Jay	Yes
2209	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caira, Maria	Yes
2210	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Costley, Keith	Yes
2211	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sederstrom, Sarah	Yes
2212	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanders, Robert	Yes
2213	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Way, Elizabeth	Yes
2214	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shields, Tawnya	Yes
2215	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meier, D.	Yes
2216	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burianek, Linda	Yes
2217	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ozuna, Michele	Yes
2218	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Serrano, Dee	Yes
2219	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vincent, J.	Yes
2220	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ramo, Carol	Yes
2221	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gramstedt, Al	Yes
2222	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sawyer, jennifer	Yes
2223	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gowern, William	Yes
2224	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	biggs, leon	Yes
2225	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swartz, Dean	Yes
2226	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Liss, Elizabeth	Yes
2227	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	riofrio, pris	Yes
2228	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sandholdt, Kim	Yes
2229	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hundemer, Sadie	Yes
2230	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sunderland, Ann Marie	Yes
2231	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moody, Patrick	Yes
2232	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDermott, Ann	Yes
2233	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Digby, Jean	Yes
2234	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heath, Frank	Yes
2235	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sain, Summey	Yes
2236	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Terhark, Theresa	Yes
2237	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hartje, Nancy	Yes
2238	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gallegos, Amber	Yes
2239	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Soraghan, Conon	Yes
2240	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bredenberg, Patricia	Yes
2241	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hartzler, Margaret	Yes
2242	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kanzler, Debbi	Yes
2243	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myers, Ed	Yes
2244	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Damian, Paul	Yes
2245	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scuder, Amanda	Yes
2246	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burrows, Rachael E	Yes
2247	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moody, James	Yes

0008531

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2248	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sperbeck, Elaine	Yes
2249	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murray, Bob	Yes
2250	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weinrich, John	Yes
2251	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	LeDent, Jamie	Yes
2252	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Plant, Leah	Yes
2253	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bejgrowicz, Thomas	Yes
2254	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bodwell, Jenny	Yes
2255	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Norman, Penni	Yes
2256	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yannotti, Michele	Yes
2257	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saude, Debra	Yes
2258	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pham, Hoa	Yes
2259	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richert, Barbara	Yes
2260	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mudrey, Susan	Yes
2261	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bagatta, joanna	Yes
2262	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Joyce, Mary Anne	Yes
2263	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	REVESZ, MR.&MRS. BRUCE	Yes
2264	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rudar, Paul R	No
2265	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hampson, James	Yes
2266	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Neihart, Joanne	Yes
2267	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	BURCHETT, KAREN	Yes
2268	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thompson, Sandra	Yes
2269	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hinzpeter, Susan C.	Yes
2270	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	BARTON, CHRIS	Yes
2271	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Potts, Natalie	Yes
2272	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Abdelnour, Margaret	Yes
2273	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schaut, Matthew	Yes
2274	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	A, J	Yes
2275	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moldovan, Robert	Yes
2276	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nickel, Joan	Yes
2277	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Louis	Yes
2278	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	davidson, Robin	Yes
2279	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marrs, Cynthia	Yes
2280	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rosser, Katharine	Yes
2281	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Root, Charlene	Yes
2282	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Palau, Fleur	Yes
2283	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graf, Rosemary	Yes
2284	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walter, Gail	Yes
2285	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Silver, Evelyn	Yes
2286	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Trois	Yes
2287	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Payne, Joan	Yes
2288	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kantor, Lois	Yes
2289	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Preston, Ken	Yes
2290	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cochrane, Nancy	Yes
2291	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Gray, Dick R	Yes
2292	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	steele, karen	Yes
2293	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barnell, Todd	Yes
2294	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meissler, Bob	Yes
2295	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elliott, Tracy	Yes
2296	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bourgeois, Paula	Yes
2297	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lamont, Juliet	Yes
2298	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	stinson, g.e.	Yes
2299	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fallica, Mary	Yes
2300	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Borchers, Margie	Yes
2301	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ungar, Luci	Yes
2302	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kerkhoff, Barbara	Yes

0008532

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2303	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Engel, Christine	Yes
2304	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vincent, Judith	Yes
2305	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rausch, Mary	Yes
2306	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ell, Christopher	Yes
2307	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Southworth, Lizabeth	Yes
2308	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rossmann, Douglas	Yes
2309	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burwell, Julia	Yes
2310	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taggart, Carol	Yes
2311	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stephenson, Luke	Yes
2312	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Arago, Marybeth	Yes
2313	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bailey, Brenda	Yes
2314	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Turnbaugh, Brian	Yes
2315	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Petersen, Doreen	Yes
2316	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Neves, Melanie	Yes
2317	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McMenamin, Sharon	Yes
2318	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marsh, Sherry	Yes
2319	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carter, Helen	Yes
2320	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swensen, Pamela	Yes
2321	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ehrman, Esther	Yes
2322	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Madsen, Karen	Yes
2323	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kolman, Michal	Yes
2324	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prigione, Sue	Yes
2325	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baron, Lee	Yes
2326	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woznicki, Michael	Yes
2327	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Warenycia, Dee	Yes
2328	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Turner, Keith	Yes
2329	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Levin, Eileen	Yes
2330	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelsey, Gale	Yes
2331	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kennedy, Vonnie	Yes
2332	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dreeszen, Carolyn	Yes
2333	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderholm, Jon	Yes
2334	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Freidberg, Colleen	Yes
2335	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Faria, Adriana	Yes
2336	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Trisha	Yes
2337	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shaw, Elizabeth	Yes
2338	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Betz, Ann	Yes
2339	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ford, Shirley	Yes
2340	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chapman, Alex	Yes
2341	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Szawan, Kim	Yes
2342	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Srok, Claudia	Yes
2343	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Herder, Jacqueline	Yes
2344	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parisi Kirby, Julie	Yes
2345	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dahlgren, PhD, Shelley	Yes
2346	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allison, Kelly	Yes
2347	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yaeger, R.	Yes
2348	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Muramatsu, Amy Tamura	Yes
2349	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cresseveur, Jessica	Yes
2350	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pace, Chris	Yes
2351	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	schmidt, roger	Yes
2352	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fortin, Guillaume	Yes
2353	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reilly, Eileen	Yes
2354	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	messina, ronald	Yes
2355	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lowry, Marsha	Yes
2356	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brickell, Julie	Yes
2357	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ridder, catherine	Yes

0008533

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2358	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eastlake, David	Yes
2359	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Novotny, Jan	Yes
2360	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hogan, Judith	Yes
2361	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pence, Lewis	Yes
2362	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	harvey, jeanie	Yes
2363	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDaniel, Thelma	Yes
2364	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Turk, Patricia	Yes
2365	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Cynthia	Yes
2366	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bryant, Elizabeth	Yes
2367	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Auris, Jean	Yes
2368	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klinsport, Kay	Yes
2369	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Casey, Jean	Yes
2370	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sheehan, Ponie	Yes
2371	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Su, Johnny	Yes
2372	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Craig K	No
2373	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schaefer, Gretchen	Yes
2374	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Temple, Michele	Yes
2375	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koivisto, Ellen	Yes
2376	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crame, Kimberly	Yes
2377	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rodriguez, Thomas	Yes
2378	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reed, Brittany	Yes
2379	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeTora, Danny	Yes
2380	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	persichetty, rita	Yes
2381	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moorleggen, Melissa	Yes
2382	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moran, Rosalen	Yes
2383	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	dICKMON, IILLIAN	Yes
2384	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stubblebine, Warren	Yes
2385	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morgan, Pamela	Yes
2386	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meyers, Rosemary	Yes
2387	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rodriguez, Ray	Yes
2388	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bates, Jennifer	Yes
2389	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kraeszig, Mary	Yes
2390	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Mary	Yes
2391	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pitney, Lynn	Yes
2392	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tan, Frances	Yes
2393	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly Wright, Monica	Yes
2394	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Torre-Bueno, Ava	Yes
2395	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burpee, Kathy	Yes
2396	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spalla, Linda	Yes
2397	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steffy, Heidi	Yes
2398	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holtz, Barbara	Yes
2399	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	DIFF	griffin, nicholas h	Yes
2400	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	DIFF	Griffin, houston t	No
2401	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Dorn, Carolyn	Yes
2402	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donaldson, Mark	Yes
2403	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lang, Glenna	Yes
2404	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shrader, Susanne	Yes
2405	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	HEY, LISA	Yes
2406	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ripalda, Oscar	Yes
2407	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	GILLESPIE, SHARON	Yes
2408	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Monigold, Sarah	Yes
2409	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kozel, Tom	Yes
2410	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	diff	griffin, jamie m	Yes
2411	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zuurdeeg, Walter	Yes
2412	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	von Koch, R T	Yes
2413	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Book, Joan	Yes

0008534

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2414	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rich, Sharon	Yes
2415	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	weil, carrie	Yes
2416	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ellsworth, Kathi	Yes
2417	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Danta, Rosalia	Yes
2418	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mangiaracina, kristine	Yes
2419	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	shouse, marianne	Yes
2420	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Impellitier, Mary	Yes
2421	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MARCUSSEN, PAUL	Yes
2422	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ledden, Dennis	Yes
2423	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Connor, Lynn	Yes
2424	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Petroskas, John	Yes
2425	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gazzola, Linda	Yes
2426	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lombardi, Robert	Yes
2427	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Foley, Erin	Yes
2428	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Acosta, Peggy	Yes
2429	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Temme, Olive Joy	Yes
2430	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hurley, Gaylene	Yes
2431	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jaeger, Anna	No
2432	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hunt-Rossmann, krista	Yes
2433	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDonald, Autumn	Yes
2434	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rossi, Ray	Yes
2435	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pienciak, Sue	Yes
2436	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Falwell, Cynthia	Yes
2437	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Felden, John	Yes
2438	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Soffler, Judy W.	Yes
2439	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	morey, mary	Yes
2440	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zalon, Susan	Yes
2441	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greene, Gwen	Yes
2442	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	haslett, dora	Yes
2443	4/30/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Balog, Ranko	Yes
2444	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bradshaw, Lael	Yes
2445	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolfson, Toni	Yes
2446	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zimmerman, Deanna	Yes
2447	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jimenez, Adriana	Yes
2448	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murchison, R.Pp., Rev. Robert E. Spiritwalker	Yes
2449	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	alexander, thomas	Yes
2450	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Byerley, Rebeca	Yes
2451	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jennings, Cheryl	Yes
2452	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mendieta, Vince	Yes
2453	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Delaney, Sean	Yes
2454	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coleman, J.B.	Yes
2455	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Wigfield, Lucas	No
2456	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vazquez, Alicia	Yes
2457	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duerr, Erik	Yes
2458	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cooper, Jack	Yes
2459	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lerner,M.D., Albert	Yes
2460	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	von Heissen, Roswitha	Yes
2461	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Emily	Yes
2462	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hall, Jennifer	Yes
2463	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tart, Lisa	Yes
2464	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	HVCA	Ballance Jr., William W	Yes
2465	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Balloch, Sharon	Yes
2466	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tilley, Kimberly	Yes
2467	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Noyes, Anne	Yes
2468	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Timothy, Doss N	Yes

0008535

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2469	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keltonic, Emily D.	Yes
2470	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	STE. CLAIRE, NINETTE	Yes
2471	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jenkins, Linda	Yes
2472	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Everest Contractors, LLC Member	Eskew, Mark	No
2473	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	N/A	Tidd, Shelley	No
2474	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	gray, lynn	Yes
2475	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Huntoon, Kristin	Yes
2476	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Biggs, Susannah	Yes
2477	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gutfleisch, Ellen	Yes
2478	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Diamante, Todd A	No
2479	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Knowles, Jeanelle R	No
2480	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pullen, Drew	Yes
2481	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ambrose, Frank	Yes
2482	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Phillips, Gail L	No
2483	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudspeth, Jeremy T	No
2484	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chamberlain, Jon	Yes
2485	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heggy, Ben	Yes
2486	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hodgson, Ramon	Yes
2487	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hemmila, rodney	Yes
2488	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roberts, Jamie	Yes
2489	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McHam, Laura	Yes
2490	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Theodosiadis, Eva	Yes
2491	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hageman, Warren	Yes
2492	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roggenkamp, Sandy	Yes
2493	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, James C	No
2494	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Landwehr, Sally	Yes
2495	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Foss, Janice	Yes
2496	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Newell, Sandra	Yes
2497	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nodurft, Shane	Yes
2498	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Krueger, Beth	Yes
2499	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taylor, J. Holley	Yes
2500	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ouradnik, Luke	Yes
2501	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kennedy, jeff k	Yes
2502	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		hege, albert	Yes
2503	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Valentine, Jennifer	Yes
2504	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	cozzi, michael	Yes
2505	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roman, Charlette	Yes
2506	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dick, Dorothy	Yes
2507	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kranidis, Mary Anne	Yes
2508	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Linsley, Steve	Yes
2509	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Westervelt, Frederic B	No
2510	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tidwell, Amber	Yes
2511	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bonitatibus, Susan	Yes
2512	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heiden, Patricia	Yes
2513	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mullins, Wayne	Yes
2514	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stichweh, Kerry	Yes
2515	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	DIFF	Wasson, Robert L	No
2516	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Costa, Francisco	Yes
2517	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kennedy, Timothy	Yes
2518	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Kevin	Yes
2519	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lehmkuhl, marlene	Yes
2520	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rivera-Shapiro, Mirian	Yes
2521	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Upshaw, Laurel	Yes
2522	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Worgul, Jeanne	No
2523	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Worcester, Naomi	Yes

0008536

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2524	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pound, Michael	Yes
2525	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ogren, Lorrie	Yes
2526	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Stephanie	Yes
2527	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Danel, Lyssa H	Yes
2528	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bender, Kristen	Yes
2529	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goodman, Lisa	Yes
2530	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bloom, Richard	Yes
2531	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beer, Julie	Yes
2532	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Klingner, Joe	Yes
2533	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shouse, George A	No
2534	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Melton, Ronald W	Yes
2535	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maurer, Tara	Yes
2536	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cowen, Sylvia	Yes
2537	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cowen, Brent	Yes
2538	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Riggins, Julie S	No
2539	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barnett, Sandra	Yes
2540	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hazelton, Judith	Yes
2541	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nickelson, Ashley	Yes
2542	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bruschke, Karen W	Yes
2543	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wyman, Elizabeth	Yes
2544	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooper, Lisa	Yes
2545	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Westervelt, Frederic B	No
2546	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frey, Lisa	Yes
2547	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Neil, Daniel	Yes
2548	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zissu, Thomas	Yes
2549	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thorne, Trischa	Yes
2550	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ForTheAnimals, Katrin	Yes
2551	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Piner, Lisa	Yes
2552	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duvall, Katherine	Yes
2553	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Sue S	No
2554	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shouse, Robert	No
2555	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		beatty, bonnie	Yes
2556	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tipton, Bill	Yes
2557	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Armstrong-lovanovici, Carol	Yes
2558	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brooks, Anne	Yes
2559	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	RHODES, DIANE	Yes
2560	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	m, k	Yes
2561	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	abbott, steve	Yes
2562	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		konnick, chris	Yes
2563	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudspeth, Zachary T	No
2564	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudspeth, Thuy	No
2565	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stuckey, Cindy	Yes
2566	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Salk, Pj	Yes
2567	5/1/2010	Yes (424973)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudspeth, Steve N	No
2568	5/1/2010	Master (424973)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudspeth, David A	No
2569	5/1/2010	Yes (424973)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reavis, Dan	No
2570	5/1/2010	Yes (424973)	Unaffiliated Individual		Patterson, Steven P	No
2571	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zoldak, Loretta	Yes
2572	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parson, Tom	Yes
2573	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kennan, Eden	Yes
2574	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Laz, Jo	Yes
2575	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	M, P	Yes
2576	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kladke, Robin	Yes
2577	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Piddington, Elaine M	Yes
2578	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marotto, Ruth W	Yes

0008537

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2579	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Allyn	Yes
2580	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Harry	Yes
2581	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Packer, Patti	Yes
2582	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	laplante MD, MPH, sharron lee	Yes
2583	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hein, Claudia	Yes
2584	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swenson, Daniel	Yes
2585	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barthelson, Roger	Yes
2586	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duda, Tim	Yes
2587	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gordon, Wendy	Yes
2588	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA NC	nowell, robert b	Yes
2589	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kuster, Mary	Yes
2590	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gallo, Patti	Yes
2591	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sirotkin, Kristin	Yes
2592	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jay, Bonnie	Yes
2593	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Berger, Sally	Yes
2594	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Confer, Jeremy	Yes
2595	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rogers, Irene	Yes
2596	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robbins Smith, Jennifer	Yes
2597	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myers, Corinne	Yes
2598	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young, Sharon	Yes
2599	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Banks, Jerry	Yes
2600	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morello, B	Yes
2601	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lawler, Martha	Yes
2602	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vershum, Judy	Yes
2603	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tiedeman, Ann	Yes
2604	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mahn, Marion	Yes
2605	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barry, Bethany	Yes
2606	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Frances	Yes
2607	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holcomb, Brad	No
2608	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tart, Christopher B	No
2609	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tart, Christopher B	No
2610	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Struble, Daniel	Yes
2611	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	briggs, josephine	Yes
2612	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Franko, Brooke	Yes
2613	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGinnis, June	Yes
2614	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clark, Susan	Yes
2615	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Donnell, Julie	Yes
2616	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cotter, Robert	Yes
2617	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jaeger, Diana	Yes
2618	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Baum, Johnnie	Yes
2619	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		SENIOR, JOE L	No
2620	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strother, Martha	Yes
2621	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Donnell, Kelly	Yes
2622	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leuenberger, Carol	Yes
2623	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Claycomb, Denise	Yes
2624	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chumley, Niles	Yes
2625	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lundquist, Judy	Yes
2626	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	I, Dale	Yes
2627	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Helen	Yes
2628	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lauck, Sarah	Yes
2629	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rautus, Toni	Yes
2630	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gennarelli, Jesse	Yes
2631	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meier, Cora Lee	Yes
2632	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Travis, Teri	Yes
2633	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simpson, Hyatt	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2634	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dalton, Nan	Yes
2635	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A A	No
2636	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richey, Betty	Yes
2637	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	stuart, darcie	Yes
2638	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Foskett, MaryAnna	Yes
2639	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dolins, Francine	Yes
2640	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Trupin, Joel	Yes
2641	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fenster, Steven	Yes
2642	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2643	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duffy, Michael	Yes
2644	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	williams, Andy	Yes
2645	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoppenbrouwers, Elke	Yes
2646	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCarthy, Debbie	Yes
2647	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Luigart, Craig B	Yes
2648	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Ashlee	Yes
2649	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roberts, Katherine	Yes
2650	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siegmann, Suzy	Yes
2651	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Giese, John	Yes
2652	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilchrist, Gerald	Yes
2653	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Milford, Joan	Yes
2654	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hull, Ron	Yes
2655	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meza, Joel	Yes
2656	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peters, Emily	Yes
2657	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Entley, Hilary	Yes
2658	5/1/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aversa, Amy	Yes
2659	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Priceman, Ann Beth	Yes
2660	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kuhn, Susan	Yes
2661	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gordon, Suzie	Yes
2662	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tibbot, Ann	Yes
2663	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Platizky, Franklin	Yes
2664	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Espinosa, Natalia4	Yes
2665	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martens, Bill	Yes
2666	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Campbell, Steven	Yes
2667	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		marziale, peter j	Yes
2668	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		bailey, pam	No
2669	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	LeBlanc, Candy	Yes
2670	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grundmann, Lisa	Yes
2671	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mauricio, Laura	Yes
2672	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		johnson, barry	Yes
2673	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Russell, Betty T	No
2674	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Preserve Our Beach	Pinner, Johnny R	Yes
2675	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2676	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Delano, Joe	Yes
2677	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marshall, Margaret	Yes
2678	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Quintana, Barbara	Yes
2679	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Paradise, Brian	Yes
2680	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dempsey, Suzanne	Yes
2681	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richards, Scott	Yes
2682	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2683	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grant, David	Yes
2684	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Padilla, Anne	Yes
2685	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carroll, Mark	Yes
2686	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pipa, Ron	Yes
2687	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Butscher, Alicia	Yes
2688	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pfeifer, Nezka	Yes
2689	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mayo , Jeanne	Yes

0008539

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2690	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Joan E	No
2691	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stahl, James G	No
2692	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thompson, Stacy	Yes
2693	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	A, Maggie	Yes
2694	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Korby, Sylvia	Yes
2695	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NC Fish and Game	Surfer, Concerned	Yes
2696	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dean, Larry R	Yes
2697	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Plagge, Angela	Yes
2698	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coe, Michael	Yes
2699	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steffner, Susan	Yes
2700	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Knight, Diannalea	Yes
2701	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oneal, Bud	Yes
2702	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kriedeman, Christina	Yes
2703	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saslow, Randi	Yes
2704	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mcquaid, Karen	Yes
2705	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holter, Norbert	Yes
2706	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brady, Margaret	Yes
2707	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Plumb, SuSanne Dawn	Yes
2708	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tolbert, Jon G	No
2709	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Egelhoff, Tom	No
2710	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Surratt, Presley	Yes
2711	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	watkins, ann	Yes
2712	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	scott, joan	Yes
2713	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Olmedo, Kristina	Yes
2714	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, Ed	Yes
2715	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sego, Christopher	Yes
2716	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Matthijssen, Henriette	Yes
2717	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Papayanopoulos, Constantin	Yes
2718	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zovistoski, Charlotte K	No
2719	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bollinger, Jacqueline	Yes
2720	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
2721	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Papayanopoulos, Sherrie	Yes
2722	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Diamond, Lilith	Yes
2723	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Davis Island Fishing Foundation	Wasson, Bob L	No
2724	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA & OPBA	Chapman, Kevin E	No
2725	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Snyder, Cheryl	Yes
2726	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Onofrey, Shea	Yes
2727	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bitner, Stephen	No
2728	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamm, William F	No
2729	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dymott, Michael E	Yes
2730	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Liptay, Steve	Yes
2731	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bradley, Vernon L	No
2732	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schoonmaker, Captain Charles C	Yes
2733	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	diff	beeson, ann	No
2734	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Mike R	Yes
2735	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA NCBBA	Pate, Ben C	Yes
2736	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CLMS	Brock, Joel P	Yes
2737	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chadoir, Kim	Yes
2738	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sherwood, Dan	Yes
2739	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Glenn, Sarah	Yes
2740	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Loveday, Charles H	Yes
2741	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Livengood, Mike c	No

0008540

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2742	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barefoot, James O	Yes
2743	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2744	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sventy, Robert	Yes
2745	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chynoweth, Iris	Yes
2746	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		hooks, joe t	No
2747	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Surratt, Presley	Yes
2748	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neal, Lianne J	No
2749	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		van dusen, alison	Yes
2750	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hall, Mary	Yes
2751	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	DIFF	Laughlin, Kenneth M	Yes
2752	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hamsher, Donna	Yes
2753	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	gonzalez, cheyenne	Yes
2754	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wyncoop, Carole B	Yes
2755	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Books, Jennifer	Yes
2756	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	griffith, Rosemary	Yes
2757	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2758	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brallier, Donna	Yes
2759	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vactor, Alex	Yes
2760	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lucas, Jeffrey C	No
2761	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gatto, Gina	Yes
2762	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Piercy, Jen	Yes
2763	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kenyon, Richard	Yes
2764	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pate, Lisa	Yes
2765	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Naylor, David W	No
2766	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bard, Brigitte	Yes
2767	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holsinger, Michael	Yes
2768	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McDaniel, Thomas	Yes
2769	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curtler III, Hugh	Yes
2770	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCrary, Chad	Yes
2771	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moss, Sharon	Yes
2772	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hayter, Jan	Yes
2773	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DiMarcello, Belinda	Yes
2774	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boyce, Robert	Yes
2775	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Viglia II, Peter	Yes
2776	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peraro, Christopher	Yes
2777	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smaluk-Nix, Kathleen	Yes
2778	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reynolds, Peter	Yes
2779	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pinks, Shelly	Yes
2780	5/2/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bowman, Candy	Yes
2781	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, c	Yes
2782	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	von Hippel, Peter and Josephine	Yes
2783	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hernandez, Wendy	Yes
2784	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Detmer, Chris	Yes
2785	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mcKay, jeff	Yes
2786	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	perrine, danielle	Yes
2787	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Roseann	Yes
2788	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		martin, mark a	Yes
2789	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whitfield, Rufus L	Yes
2790	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McNicholas, David A	Yes
2791	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	DIFF	MITCHUM, LANIER L	No
2792	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA-NC	West, Peter E	Yes
2793	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	official representative	Woodroof, Steve K	No
2794	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2795	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MacSweeney, Joan	Yes
2796	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McAden, Michael E	Yes

0008541

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2797	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Genova, James C	No
2798	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Almond, James H	Yes
2799	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	U.S. Citizen	Klotz, Steve	Yes
2800	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ferguson, Larry S	Yes
2801	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vasily, Karen	Yes
2802	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gillespie, Candace	Yes
2803	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Diff Club	Johnston III, Thomas A	Yes
2804	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hammet, Betsy	Yes
2805	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grant, Susan	Yes
2806	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Travers, L. J.	Yes
2807	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Estes, Jerry G	No
2808	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Farrell, J.J. J	Yes
2809	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holcomb, James B	Yes
2810	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holcomb, Julia W	Yes
2811	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
2812	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ritter, Nicole	No
2813	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brugh, LeAnne	No
2814	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	leek, kathy	Yes
2815	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Malick, Vicki	Yes
2816	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	shippam, christine	Yes
2817	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	kline, deanna	Yes
2818	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Apere, Diane	Yes
2819	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chamberlain, Marlene	Yes
2820	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Travis, Jannelle	Yes
2821	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dorsett, Richard D	Yes
2822	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ritter, William K	Yes
2823	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		anderson, jessie	Yes
2824	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		barnes, patrick l	Yes
2825	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		fishel, steven d	Yes
2826	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schooley, Carol	Yes
2827	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Montgomery, Celia	Yes
2828	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tylenda, Prudence	Yes
2829	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drennan, Jill	Yes
2830	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beach Lover, John	Yes
2831	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Venable, Wayne	No
2832	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwarz, Richard	No
2833	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Watson, Gregory D	Yes
2834	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bradley, Elizabeth	Yes
2835	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	platt, penny	Yes
2836	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Larsen, Sarah	Yes
2837	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hooper, Jennifer L	No
2838	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		mclawhon, billy r	Yes
2839	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hogan, Sheryl	Yes
2840	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jessup, Nicole	Yes
2841	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCurdy, Alan	Yes
2842	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marvin, Judith	Yes
2843	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cavins, John F	No
2844	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CLMS	Lashley, M	Yes
2845	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sisolak, Tiffany	Yes
2846	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Slingluff, David	No
2847	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Petti, Glenn D	No
2848	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Paynter, Mary	Yes
2849	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Budzik, Marcin	No
2850	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shafer, Joe	No
2851	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gagliano, Melissa	Yes
2852	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wagner, Donald	Yes

0008542

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2853	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2854	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lena, John	Yes
2855	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graham, Michelle	Yes
2856	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marine, Deborah	Yes
2857	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Juchartz, Andrea	Yes
2858	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blanton, Thomas E	No
2859	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dogan, Ozzy	No
2860	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	United States Coast Guard U.S. Merchant Marine Officer	Hales III, Erwin J	Yes
2861	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gontero, Clara	Yes
2862	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rogers, Page	Yes
2863	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wiseman, Ann	Yes
2864	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Doesserich, Diane	Yes
2865	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Manildi, Barbara	Yes
2866	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dye, Grady N	Yes
2867	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2868	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		obernesser, jane	No
2869	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crandall, Josh	Yes
2870	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKeon, Thomas C	Yes
2871	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aldrich, Christine	Yes
2872	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pardee, Cathy	Yes
2873	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prokopowycz, Maria	Yes
2874	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pylypowycz, Christine	Yes
2875	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Donald	Yes
2876	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heitz, Stephen T	No
2877	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eastman, Catherine B	No
2878	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bonday, Steven R	Yes
2879	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Butler, Mike p	Yes
2880	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bozell, David	Yes
2881	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Prodanchek, Paulette S	Yes
2882	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Forbes	Sivertson, Gary T	No
2883	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		MacLellan, Barbara J	Yes
2884	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heilman, Daniel	No
2885	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2886	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bozell, Laura	Yes
2887	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	gaard, greta	Yes
2888	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Corzo, Cara	Yes
2889	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Evans, Kyiah Shekanna	Yes
2890	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	(No organization)	Bozell, Caitlin M	Yes
2891	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Patterson, Betsy	No
2892	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nye, Gordon	Yes
2893	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	taxpayer	Wallace, Deane T	Yes
2894	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thorne, Arthur L	No
2895	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Meekins, Manson R	No
2896	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Skrentny, Jeff	Yes
2897	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Creason, Jonathan	Yes
2898	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pancake, Amy	Yes
2899	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		stover, jeff l	Yes
2900	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sproul, Ben	Yes
2901	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	HUTCHESON, ROBIN	Yes
2902	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	freudiger, sabine	Yes
2903	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Collins, Sharon	Yes
2904	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	siegfus, jon	Yes
2905	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Creef, Donna V	No
2906	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	diff club	roberson, james r	No
2907	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes

0008543

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2908	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jasinski, David	Yes
2909	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bozell, Norma	Yes
2910	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wynn, Sharon B	No
2911	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mcbride, Charles	Yes
2912	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Merkel, Alison	Yes
2913	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McBride, Ann	Yes
2914	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kuticka, Sheri	Yes
2915	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mack, Gene	Yes
2916	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	None	Jennings, Larry E	No
2917	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2918	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarberry, Russell M	Yes
2919	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cherry, Wayne	Yes
2920	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surf of Sound Realty	Thach, Saren	Yes
2921	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGuire, Michael J	No
2922	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	No
2923	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eggert, Lisa	Yes
2924	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Randall, Leland	Yes
2925	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
2926	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Gregory	Yes
2927	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
2928	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blixt, Alan	Yes
2929	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swarr, MD, James	Yes
2930	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cleveland, Marlys	Yes
2931	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ferguson, Jonathan L	No
2932	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cromley, Carter B	Yes
2933	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oatman, Tom	Yes
2934	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Diane	Yes
2935	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hildreth, Darcie	Yes
2936	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barnhart, Robert J.	Yes
2937	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Islam, Carol Ann	Yes
2938	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Mark	Yes
2939	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Brett C	No
2940	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hanner, Donald S	No
2941	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Veronica L	No
2942	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hanner, Jan W	No
2943	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNeal, Serena	Yes
2944	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chaney, Lois	Yes
2945	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vaughan, Lisa	Yes
2946	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	cohen, nita	Yes
2947	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilsnack, Jonathan	Yes
2948	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mak, Mac	Yes
2949	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKeon, Mary Ellen F	Yes
2950	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yerge-Briggles, Deborah	Yes
2951	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	James, Philip	Yes
2952	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Poplawski, Tomasz	No
2953	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		lancaster, taz	No
2954	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greer, Cathy	Yes
2955	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Galletto, Leo J	Yes
2956	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marion, Larry R	No
2957	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dagner, Anne	Yes
2958	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harman, Steve	Yes
2959	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		King, Fraser	Yes
2960	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marine, Joseph	Yes
2961	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pond, Liza H	Yes
2962	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		nowalk, richard k	Yes
2963	5/3/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Fairfax Cty. Public Schools	Collins, Elizabeth T	No

0008544

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
2964	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		goss, Randy f	No
2965	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		White, Charles E	Yes
2966	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pierce, Linda	Yes
2967	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Patterson, Cynthia	Yes
2968	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
2969	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nowalk, Betty t	Yes
2970	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		stadler, gordon	Yes
2971	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DeGregorio, Joseph	Yes
2972	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Murph, Archie L	Yes
2973	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Calomeni, James & Cora	Yes
2974	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Deacy, Bob	Yes
2975	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kohan, Shayna	Yes
2976	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fischman, Lawrence	Yes
2977	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Kiteforum.com	Braeuer, Toby	No
2978	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rannes, Rosemary	Yes
2979	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stanton, L	Yes
2980	5/3/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Singh, Sid	Yes
2981	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zellers, Rosemarie	Yes
2982	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schwind, Laura	Yes
2983	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tse, Stanley	Yes
2984	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	muldrow, john	Yes
2985	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howard, Cynthia	Yes
2986	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bowman, Jason	Yes
2987	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Easter, Steve	Yes
2988	5/4/2010	Master (425463)	Unaffiliated Individual		Russell, Gregory L	No
2989	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		hooper, jimmie a	No
2990	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Dave	Yes
2991	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blecher, Bob	No
2992	5/4/2010	Master (425467)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Christine	Yes
2993	5/4/2010	Yes (425467)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Robert	Yes
2994	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		krug, jeff	No
2995	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hajost, Brian H	Yes
2996	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lyons, sally	Yes
2997	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Hatteras/Ocracoke Island Council	Thompson, Joseph E	Yes
2998	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hege, Robert L	No
2999	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		raynes, donna v	No
3000	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robinson, John M	Yes
3001	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brittle, Walter L	No
3002	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brewer, Michael	Yes
3003	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Teets, Blaine	No
3004	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3005	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Soper, Christel	Yes
3006	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Via, Ashley	Yes
3007	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3008	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ramos, Paul J	Yes
3009	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3010	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3011	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dilsaver, Floyd J	Yes
3012	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	Coastal Conservation Association	Withers, James D	Yes
3013	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NC BBA	Turner, Russ	Yes
3014	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3015	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		moorer, kelly	Yes
3016	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Tilley, William S	No

0008545

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3017	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3018	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cary, Lana L	No
3019	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	Blues Brothers	Alden, William	No
3020	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hurt, Greg	Yes
3021	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Honeycutt, Willie	Yes
3022	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA-NC	Mason, Kevin	No
3023	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3024	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	SBC Kiteboard Magazine	Bryja, John	Yes
3025	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Braun, J Richard	No
3026	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Chappelear, Don	No
3027	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		boone, john m	Yes
3028	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3029	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cary, Lana	No
3030	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA-NC	Arrington, Joel	Yes
3031	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Danny	Yes
3032	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Willis, Kerry a	Yes
3033	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CFRG	Phillips, Dean	No
3034	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bruce, Eric	Yes
3035	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carey, Paul R	Yes
3036	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Colorio, Ginamarie	Yes
3037	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garrecht, Jamila	Yes
3038	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lee, Cheryl	Yes
3039	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilder, George	Yes
3040	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pratt, John	Yes
3041	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Merriman, David M	Yes
3042	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ryan, Kevin	No
3043	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Osborne, Terri K	No
3044	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tinker, Lloyd C	Yes
3045	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bollinger, Steve T	Yes
3046	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3047	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3048	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Pope, Carl	No
3049	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	Coastal Conservation Association	Farah, George K	Yes
3050	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Raleigh Salt Water Sportfishing Club	Beetham, James P	Yes
3051	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Daniels, John A	No
3052	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3053	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shepherd, Michael E	Yes
3054	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		goschler, gary a	No
3055	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shackelford, Ronald	No
3056	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	Coastal Conservation Association of NC	Saleeby, Fred J	Yes
3057	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Akers, Robert F	Yes
3058	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		fortune, william	No
3059	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	Coastal Fisheries	N/A, N/A	No
3060	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelly, Karen D	Yes
3061	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Feldt, Betty	Yes
3062	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stines, Kenneth C	No
3063	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DIXON, JR., WILLIAM H	No
3064	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA Norht Carolina	Olsen, Richard	Yes
3065	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Penn State University	Jacobs, Steven B	No
3066	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Stearns, Bob	Yes
3067	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Bell, Jeff T	Yes
3068	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	cca	newberry, malcom	Yes
3069	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Longfellow, Jonathan D	Yes

0008546

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3070	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoover, Vicki A	No
3071	5/4/2010	Master (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bispels, Ken	Yes
3072	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Monticone, Doris C	Yes
3073	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moss, Daniel	Yes
3074	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacoby, Jim	Yes
3075	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Latham, Judith C	No
3076	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Branch, John E	No
3077	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Morris, James T	No
3078	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cook, Kenneth L	No
3079	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Millican, Glenn	Yes
3080	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Rice, David K	Yes
3081	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Crammer, Ron	Yes
3082	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	The Coastal Mariner magazine	Howell, Michael	No
3083	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3084	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stewart, David G	Yes
3085	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dean, Ken	Yes
3086	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	azoulai, alexandre	Yes
3087	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prouty, Anne	Yes
3088	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tise, Stephen	No
3089	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rikstad, Arthur J	Yes
3090	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Braack, James	No
3091	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rikstad, Arthur J	Yes
3092	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3093	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kwarziany, Alexander	Yes
3094	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sewell, Jim	No
3095	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		G, Pete R	Yes
3096	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Andrews, Lise	Yes
3097	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Love, Matthew	Yes
3098	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Andrews, Renee	Yes
3099	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Artis, Lisa	Yes
3100	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harrelson, Craig	Yes
3101	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whitlock, Audrey J	Yes
3102	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, Ken D	Yes
3103	5/4/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Oneida Lake Kitters	Chatwin, Mark S	No
3104	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Rodgers, Roderick	Yes
3105	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jonah, Jean	Yes
3106	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	DNR	Dean, Thomas J	No
3107	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kellum, Amy D	No
3108	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Davenport, Andrew & Susan	Yes
3109	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Lighthart, Myra	No
3110	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Valdmets, Lisa	No
3111	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Colburn, Joan	No
3112	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Friel, William	Yes
3113	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ragazzo, Vanessa	Yes
3114	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weiss, Sally	No
3115	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gleason, Laura	Yes
3116	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Michael D	No
3117	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3118	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3119	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rubino, Matthew	Yes
3120	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	None	PHELPS, JIM E	Yes
3121	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, John M	No
3122	5/4/2010	No	University/Professional So	Outer Banks Association of REALTORS	Sutherland, Daniel M	No

0008547

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3123	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3124	5/4/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lizer, Deja	Yes
3125	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3126	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fokes, Sean M	Yes
3127	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		martin, billy g	No
3128	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bayes, Ronald H	No
3129	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		nussbaum, patty	Yes
3130	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wood, Margaret	Yes
3131	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sweitzer, Alexandra	Yes
3132	5/4/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cleland, Rebecca E	Yes
3133	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Elizabeth City State University	San Juan, Francisco C	Yes
3134	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Long, Kathleen M	No
3135	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crews, Agnes K	No
3136	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DeCray, Judy	Yes
3137	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Deb	No
3138	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ricks, Linda M	No
3139	5/4/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		McKinley, Kristen	Yes
3140	5/4/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3141	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dalton, Nicole W	No
3142	5/4/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		McClain, Jill	Yes
3143	5/4/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Coastal Fisheries Reform Group	Hamilton, Richard B	No
3144	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer Banks Association of Realtors	Gilley, Dwayne	Yes
3145	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kindland, Suzanne	Yes
3146	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rossi, Mary	Yes
3147	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leavitt, Robert	No
3148	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ehmann, Charlie	Yes
3149	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Devore, James W	No
3150	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3151	5/4/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	NC Conservation Network	Boyer, Jayne C	Yes
3152	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stankiewicz, Dianne	No
3153	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	Fisherman	Glenn, Sam S	Yes
3154	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hahn, Debbie B	Yes
3155	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gatter, William F	Yes
3156	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sweeney, Cameron Y	Yes
3157	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Manning, Phillip	Yes
3158	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Marietta	Yes
3159	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blevins, Owen T	No
3160	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sheffield, John G	No
3161	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wall, Joan P	Yes
3162	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Long, James S	No
3163	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clegg, Ann A	No
3164	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sabiston, Michael	No
3165	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		frazier, steve h	Yes
3166	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Raisky, Kat	Yes
3167	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly, Doreen	Yes
3168	5/4/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hawkins, Paul	No
3169	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardy, Daniel F	No
3170	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peterson, Linda L	No
3171	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Turk, Kim L	No
3172	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Kathryn J	Yes
3173	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3174	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CHAC	Brady, Richard	No
3175	5/4/2010	Master (425669)	Unaffiliated Individual		Haresch, John	Yes
3176	5/4/2010	Master (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Best, Frank	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3177	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Realtor	N/A, N/A	No
3178	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3179	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		riggs, richard m	No
3180	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bustos, Norma	Yes
3181	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carlson, Cheri	Yes
3182	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Matthaei, Marcella	Yes
3183	5/4/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	NC Conservation Network	Brawner, Helen R	No
3184	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Blevins, Sharon S	No
3185	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sloss, Barbara L	Yes
3186	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bernhardt, Michael W	No
3187	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Audrey W	No
3188	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilson, A	No
3189	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Self	Jakob, Frank A	No
3190	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hodik, Barbara	No
3191	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Buckner, Carolyn M	No
3192	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Rockingham County Naturalist Club	Berry, Mary L	No
3193	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, Ben	Yes
3194	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reddy, William M	Yes
3195	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Head, John	Yes
3196	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brimm, Martha	Yes
3197	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Deal, Jeffrey G	No
3198	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Babics, William S	No
3199	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	DIFF	Brown, Scott	Yes
3200	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hall, Michaela	Yes
3201	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lawrence, Craig	Yes
3202	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boneta, Jennifer	Yes
3203	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Koenig, Ron J	Yes
3204	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	kiteboarder	Curtright, Ryan M	No
3205	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3206	5/4/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3207	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Duke University	Struhsaker, Thomas	Yes
3208	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stokes, Alfred C	Yes
3209	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3210	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
3211	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		simmons, john w	No
3212	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bridle, Kenneth	Yes
3213	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curtis, Linda	Yes
3214	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hayes, Lisa	Yes
3215	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hughes, Barbara	Yes
3216	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hood, Rose	Yes
3217	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ely, gerald e	Yes
3218	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roushdy, Juanita	Yes
3219	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Guzynski, Elizabeth	No
3220	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DUNIVAN, DAVID	No
3221	5/4/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Simms, Laurel	Yes
3222	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reeves, George	Yes
3223	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA North Carolina	Young, Thomas H	Yes
3224	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dain, Wes	Yes
3225	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clarke, David	Yes
3226	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yarnell, Susan L	No
3227	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Thomas H	Yes
3228	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRDC	Lucas, Jr., Robert T	Yes
3229	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
3230	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Megraw, Molly	Yes
3231	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Poole, Nancy	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3232	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weston, Jerry	Yes
3233	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mccarthy, julien	Yes
3234	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Thomas H	Yes
3235	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCANC	Abbott, Bud	No
3236	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Thomas H	No
3237	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Vivian L	Yes
3238	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA-NC	Garber, Gary	Yes
3239	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Southwood, Dave	Yes
3240	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		West, Pete	Yes
3241	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Chihill, Paula	No
3242	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cowal, Nancy S	No
3243	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Campbell, Christina	Yes
3244	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA North Carolina	Young, Thomas H	Yes
3245	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wall, Martin	Yes
3246	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carmon, Michelle	No
3247	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Biesack, David J	Yes
3248	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Albrecht , Audrey C	Yes
3249	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
3250	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cowal, Nancy S	No
3251	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Human Race	Seymour, Ben C	Yes
3252	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stanback, Fred	No
3253	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	nctu	N/A, N/A	Yes
3254	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dongre, Milind K	Yes
3255	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alexander-Horne, Joanne	Yes
3256	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walton, Clarence	No
3257	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Emily	Yes
3258	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA/OBPA	OBXPIRATE, Woody	No
3259	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Elliott, Lynn M	No
3260	5/4/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual		Raper, Connie K	No
3261	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon, Sierra, NCBBA	Chrystal, John	No
3262	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3263	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kane, Margaret	Yes
3264	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Marraccini, Jerry	No
3265	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hart, Teresa C	Yes
3266	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whitten, Leslie H	Yes
3267	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Roberts, Karen L	No
3268	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		chapman, michael r	Yes
3269	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		gillott, david c	Yes
3270	5/4/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stewart, Margie A	Yes
3271	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Friends of State Parks	Richardson, WJ	Yes
3272	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	ncbba	leonard, jack	No
3273	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	Got-em-on Fishing Club	Davis, Frederick N	No
3274	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weller, Steven J	No
3275	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sarkisian, Thomas S	Yes
3276	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sarkisian, Mary C	No
3277	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ware, Margaret	Yes
3278	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA North Carolina	Gray, Richard L	No
3279	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3280	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3281	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rich, Steve	Yes
3282	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Klett, Henry N	No
3283	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murdick, Jean	Yes
3284	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shaw, Phyllis	Yes
3285	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		White, Robert O	No
3286	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oakley, Rickey P	Yes
3287	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	LiveGreen	Crawford, Morgan H	No

0008550

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3288	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	MS Society	Clark, Patricia	No
3289	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davidson, James	Yes
3290	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yarborough, Letitia L	Yes
3291	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanson, Amy	Yes
3292	5/4/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Spalt, Allen	Yes
3293	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cherry, Robert P	No
3294	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brewer, Mary F	Yes
3295	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA North Carolina	Toler, Steve L	Yes
3296	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		purser, jimmy	No
3297	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ostrander, Helen M	No
3298	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Link, Elizabeth	Yes
3299	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Floyd, Aaron	Yes
3300	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnston, MM	Yes
3301	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blitch, Joanna	Yes
3302	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	diff	Hege, Albert L	Yes
3303	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shearon, Michael	No
3304	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Blair L	No
3305	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Royster, Abbie	Yes
3306	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bradburn, mindy	Yes
3307	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schwery, Kathleen	Yes
3308	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	clegg, Sarah	Yes
3309	5/4/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hilliard, Jeff	Yes
3310	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3311	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Brien, Kate	Yes
3312	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Richards, Diana	No
3313	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lorch, Frank	No
3314	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3315	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Francis, Andriliunas	No
3316	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coe, Melissa	Yes
3317	5/4/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Outer Banks Paddlers Club	Ritt, Clifford W	No
3318	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fitzgerald, Thomas L	No
3319	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Senyszyn, Paul	Yes
3320	5/4/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kalet, Richard M	No
3321	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vanderford, Brian W	No
3322	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanchez, JessLee	Yes
3323	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Payne, Stanley C	No
3324	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kerekes, A	Yes
3325	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hay, Sam	No
3326	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCCN	Loftis, Christopher B	Yes
3327	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bittorf, Charles R.	Yes
3328	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		walker, jeff a	No
3329	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Riggins, Marshall G	Yes
3330	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	APOA	Baine, Robert B	No
3331	5/4/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Campbell, Charlotte	Yes
3332	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Laughridge, Charkes H	No
3333	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA , NCBBA	Moorefield, James F	Yes
3334	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wyant, Devona R	Yes
3335	5/5/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Penninger, Vickie	Yes
3336	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thompson, Tami J	Yes
3337	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Piendel, David B	No
3338	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Keith R	No
3339	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		brown, paul b	Yes
3340	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fediaczko, Gordon	No
3341	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	cca	oppenheim, ken r	No
3342	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Babics, William	No
3343	5/5/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	NC CONSERVATION NETWORK	LANE, LINDA S	No

0008551

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3344	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		solem, sue-anne	Yes
3345	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Casey, Thomas	Yes
3346	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Ward, Cierra L	Yes
3347	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Alan R	No
3348	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grabowski, Donna	Yes
3349	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Metzgar, Michael	No
3350	5/5/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Triangle Older Women's League, incoming President	Mackie, Margaret ANNE W	No
3351	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swanson, Terri K	Yes
3352	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parnell, Rachel	Yes
3353	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		gregory, larry f	Yes
3354	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NC Conservation Network	Markey, Carol	No
3355	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Park user	Jelinek, Fred	Yes
3356	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schaefer, Eric	Yes
3357	5/5/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual		V , Mike	No
3358	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Thomas, Jebson C	Yes
3359	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Diane Z	Yes
3360	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Angenent, Ernst	Yes
3361	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adams, Paula	Yes
3362	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Owens, Steve	Yes
3363	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		warner, dennis m	No
3364	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Canniff, James D	Yes
3365	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Upton, James D	No
3366	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Upton, James D	No
3367	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Caldwell, Gina M	No
3368	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crall, Mitzi	No
3369	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Ontario Kiteboarding Association	Rastonis, Peter I	Yes
3370	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bowditch, Ben	No
3371	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Christie, Brandon N	No
3372	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cochran, Sarah	Yes
3373	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blakaitis, Todd J	Yes
3374	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3375	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Blumenthal, Joel	No
3376	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weir, Dallas M	No
3377	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Claude R	No
3378	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	self	Wood, Steve	No
3379	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		reeder, anthony q	Yes
3380	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		fripp, archibald I	No
3381	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Curtis, Glenn A	Yes
3382	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Michaelis, Adriane	Yes
3383	5/5/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	NC Wildlife Association	McCormick, Robert B	No
3384	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3385	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3386	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pedder, Carol	Yes
3387	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reissig, Tom	Yes
3388	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marshall, Cynthia	Yes
3389	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wenzlaff, Carla	Yes
3390	5/5/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Porter, Kim	Yes
3391	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holbrook, Ann	Yes
3392	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Laskowich, Erin	Yes
3393	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	garrett, patricia	Yes
3394	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sewald, Allyn	Yes
3395	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koechling, Kathleen	Yes
3396	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Langhus, Jill	Yes
3397	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cook, Robert J	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3398	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ryan, Stephen	Yes
3399	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rapant, William L	No
3400	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Grimes, Christopher W	Yes
3401	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Center	Cohen, Adam L	Yes
3402	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCauley, Lon	Yes
3403	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curran, Matt	Yes
3404	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ballard, Donna	Yes
3405	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barre, Abby	Yes
3406	5/5/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Froggatt, Jory L	No
3407	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crean, Heidi G	Yes
3408	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Patterson, Nathan W	Yes
3409	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jacques, Windsor	No
3410	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Teague, David B	Yes
3411	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McBride, Boni	Yes
3412	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Leslie	Yes
3413	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scattergood, Sue	Yes
3414	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolk, Robert	Yes
3415	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Stavenger, William	No
3416	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kuhn, Dana A	No
3417	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Collins Vista II, LLC	Jefferson, Charles	Yes
3418	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Binder, Randy	Yes
3419	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kane, Elizabeth	Yes
3420	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Banchetti, Marina	Yes
3421	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilbert, Susan	Yes
3422	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Runyon, Anne	Yes
3423	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Michaelis, Erin	Yes
3424	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Folmer, Jacob	Yes
3425	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		saylor, nigel	No
3426	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Santacroce, Michael	Yes
3427	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walston, James P	Yes
3428	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Winder, Virginia	Yes
3429	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Linda	Yes
3430	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA,CHAC,OBPA	Gaskins Jr., Lloyd E	No
3431	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon Society	Poovey, Phil	Yes
3432	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	lund university	cilio, corrado M	No
3433	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hollobon, Richard	Yes
3434	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Perry, jesse	Yes
3435	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	HVCA	Ballance Jr., William W	Yes
3436	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lowe, Bryan A	No
3437	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Taiyo Designs	Jones, Eliot	No
3438	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Montanus, Andrew J	Yes
3439	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Paradise, Brian G	Yes
3440	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	HVCA	Ballance, William W	Yes
3441	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRDC	Strong, Timothy P	No
3442	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Boeh, Mitch J	No
3443	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Shaw, Bryan	Yes
3444	5/5/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ambrose, Sharon M	Yes
3445	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dickey, Kelley	Yes
3446	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Killough, Sharon	Yes
3447	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Balazy, Tracy	Yes
3448	5/5/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual		Frank, Harriette M	No
3449	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mullinax, Janet g	No
3450	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Matthews, Catherine E	No
3451	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holt, W. Jefferson	Yes
3452	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holden, Ed	Yes

0008553

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3453	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3454	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hart, SaraH	Yes
3455	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Midgette, Barbara A	Yes
3456	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3457	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3458	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cowal, Deborah A	Yes
3459	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bass, Darren	Yes
3460	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fulkerson, Robert	Yes
3461	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Evans, Ryan P	Yes
3462	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vogel, Cathrine	Yes
3463	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davenport, Byrd W	Yes
3464	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cowal, Rory	No
3465	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Patrick	Yes
3466	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cerf, Cody	Yes
3467	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fabis, Jens	Yes
3468	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lakatos, Andrew	No
3469	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilman, Monica	Yes
3470	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Currier, James	Yes
3471	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ruscito, Joe	Yes
3472	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3473	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Houston, Amy B	No
3474	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Washburn, Karen	Yes
3475	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fripp, Jean C	Yes
3476	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
3477	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fowler, Greg C	Yes
3478	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bourque, Don	Yes
3479	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holloway, Sally	Yes
3480	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wooten, Rachael	Yes
3481	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3482	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3483	5/5/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sudderth, Shannon	No
3484	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kim, Edward D	Yes
3485	5/5/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fenn, Kathryn K	Yes
3486	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal and James	No
3487	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lahmer, Markus	No
3488	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal and James	No
3489	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal and James	No
3490	5/5/2010	Master (426019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rich, Steve	Yes
3491	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Iamm, James S.	No
3492	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Paul	Yes
3493	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zeigler, Donna	Yes
3494	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edelman, Erica	Yes
3495	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brosnan, John F	Yes
3496	5/5/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Croatan Earth First!	Nemecz, Attila	No
3497	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gnecco, Gregg	No
3498	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	LaVigne, Carole	Yes
3499	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fox, John	Yes
3500	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crane, Donna	Yes
3501	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3502	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3503	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Walter, George M	No
3504	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Peter	Yes
3505	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hartman, Heidi	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3506	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider	N/A, N/A	No
3507	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cabaniss, III, Robert W	Yes
3508	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Christopher, Caroline	No
3509	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Geist, Kathleen E	Yes
3510	5/5/2010	Master (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Madre, Sandy L	No
3511	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	St. Clair Landing Campground	Ducharme, Sheri W	No
3512	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lapenter, Catherine	Yes
3513	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McBride, Mary	Yes
3514	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	STECKEL, SHARI	Yes
3515	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
3516	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Potter, Nancy	No
3517	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3518	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neal, Lianne J	No
3519	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kassakian, Steven	No
3520	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rodriguez, Ramon F	Yes
3521	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Michaelis, Harold	Yes
3522	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hunt, Jane	Yes
3523	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mathews, Randal G	No
3524	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Delasco, Catherine C	Yes
3525	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scheinman, Daniel	No
3526	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Donovan, Jennifer N	Yes
3527	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beeks, Christine E	Yes
3528	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		gebeneter, josef	Yes
3529	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyons, Ted	Yes
3530	5/5/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		johnson, robert w	No
3531	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Scheinman, Jon	No
3532	5/5/2010	No	Business	Patina Collaborative	Hales, Jennifer L	No
3533	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Koepf, Pamela A	No
3534	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Purinai, Joseph T	No
3535	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bowen, Frank	No
3536	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3537	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Donna	Yes
3538	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Born, Trevor	No
3539	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Richard V	No
3540	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Competition Pools Svc.	Stefanelli, Vincent	No
3541	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Tuttle, Ken	Yes
3542	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steighner, Ann	Yes
3543	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kiel, Carolyn	Yes
3544	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Horizon Engineering & Consulting, Inc.	Horne, James T	Yes
3545	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		warner, dennis m	No
3546	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sargent, Cory	No
3547	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ryan, Michael	Yes
3548	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Traykovski, Peter	No
3549	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ferris, James	No
3550	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Turrubiate, K	Yes
3551	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3552	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Patton, Todd C	No
3553	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	IKO	Rugina, Claudio	Yes
3554	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	ugu	c, Peter	No
3555	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		pietrolucci, stefano	Yes
3556	5/5/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Steindorfer, Adi	No
3557	5/5/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	foelix, vernessa	Yes
3558	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Redman, Robert M	No
3559	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hannan, Kathleen	Yes
3560	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3561	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		M, Karsten	No
3562	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Langner, Chris	No
3563	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hand, Gary e	Yes
3564	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, Stacy	Yes
3565	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kauenhowen, Claas	Yes
3566	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kanes, Jessica	Yes
3567	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wenger, Tasha	Yes
3568	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Teles, Sofia	Yes
3569	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Central Piedmont Group of the NC Sierra Club	Gupton, William	No
3570	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3571	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	WEF Pages	Fuller, Warren E	No
3572	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	campbell, marta	Yes
3573	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Vogel, David	Yes
3574	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		jefferson, mark d	No
3575	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beiderwell, Paul	Yes
3576	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Aimone, James	No
3577	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Shutt, Judson H	No
3578	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Walsh, Kenneth E	No
3579	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lowe, Thomas P	Yes
3580	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gubinski, Victor	Yes
3581	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Ocracoke property owner	Self, Michael M	No
3582	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woodiwiss, Kim	Yes
3583	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Drebushenko, Lisa	No
3584	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Council, Richard B	Yes
3585	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schloendorff, Georg	Yes
3586	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Carol	Yes
3587	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Faurot, Keturah	Yes
3588	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Blakaitis, Joelle P	Yes
3589	5/6/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	Coastal Conservation Association / Ducks Unlimited	Chatham, Alexander	No
3590	5/6/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3591	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Christy, Chad	Yes
3592	5/6/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wood, David L	Yes
3593	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bleck, Gary T	Yes
3594	5/6/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	Cape Hatteras Anglers Club	Glynn, Mike	Yes
3595	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Breaux, Allison L	No
3596	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Newman, Kenneth A	No
3597	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mullen, Judy	No
3598	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spagnol, Thom	Yes
3599	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Weber, Philip	No
3600	5/6/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		parks, donald d	Yes
3601	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Connelly, Hank	Yes
3602	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Amos, Jerry L	No
3603	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3604	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ford, Mary	Yes
3605	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hughes, Richard J	Yes
3606	4/20/2010	No	Civic Groups	Outer Banks Group	unknown, unknown	No
3607	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		unknown, unknown	No
3608	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Laudenslager, John	No
3609	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Nicole L	No
3610	4/26/2010	No	County Government	Dare County	unknown, unknown	No
3611	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thorne, Cindy	No
3612	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal and James	No

0008556

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3613	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal and James	No
3614	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal and James	No
3615	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sweeney, Shaun	Yes
3616	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal and James	No
3617	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal and James	No
3618	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barker, Doug	No
3619	5/6/2010	No	Business	Reality	McLean, Angus D	No
3620	4/26/2010	No	Business	Frank & Fran's The Fisherman's Friend, Inc.	Folb, Frank	No
3621	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Trufan, Hal	No
3622	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Farrelly, Matthew	Yes
3623	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boone, Emily	Yes
3624	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strathmann, Nicole	Yes
3625	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rochester, Mary	Yes
3626	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Manthei-Lund, Carolyn	Yes
3627	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Poorker, Craig	Yes
3628	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dutton, Michael	Yes
3629	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williamson, Maria	Yes
3630	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Primus, Carolyn	Yes
3631	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cichoski, Angela	Yes
3632	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vance, Robert	Yes
3633	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacobsen, Charles	Yes
3634	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Willis, Dave	Yes
3635	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reaves, Gerri	Yes
3636	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taylor, Stephen	Yes
3637	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Sanford	Yes
3638	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Diamond, Larry	Yes
3639	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frohn, Joyce	Yes
3640	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gibson, Estelle	Yes
3641	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dolowitz, Alexander	Yes
3642	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ferguson, Lori	Yes
3643	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lane, CJ	Yes
3644	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Price, Leecia	Yes
3645	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pearson, Sandra	Yes
3646	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	dills, linda	Yes
3647	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gabig, Kathryn	Yes
3648	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cottle, Daniel	Yes
3649	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	kessler, ric	Yes
3650	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heathcoat, David	Yes
3651	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Niese, William	Yes
3652	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	radell, george	Yes
3653	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pearson, nancy	Yes
3654	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greil, Judith	Yes
3655	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weber, Ted	Yes
3656	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robinson, Cathy	Yes
3657	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pomeroy, Christopher	Yes
3658	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rantala, Mervi	Yes
3659	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martinez, Manny	Yes
3660	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hasbrouck, Phyllis	Yes
3661	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bragonier, Emily	Yes
3662	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Painter, James & Carolyn	Yes

0008557

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3663	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alessi, Mr J R	Yes
3664	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Patlak, Maryanne	Yes
3665	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koshak, Greg	Yes
3666	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gumbs, MD, Brian	Yes
3667	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zendeh, Soheil	Yes
3668	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kasper, Janice	Yes
3669	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maddox, Victor	Yes
3670	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Mr & Mrs Ross	Yes
3671	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Judith	Yes
3672	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Carol	Yes
3673	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bunton, barbara	Yes
3674	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sample, Charles	Yes
3675	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	RUTLEDGE, SUSAN	Yes
3676	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adamski, Thomas	Yes
3677	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bianco, Ischel	Yes
3678	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	PETRO, JOHN	Yes
3679	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, Helene	Yes
3680	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Southerland, Ada	Yes
3681	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caylor, Rob	Yes
3682	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fisher, David	Yes
3683	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	crespo, gloira	Yes
3684	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MacArthur, Karen	Yes
3685	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	River, Sage	Yes
3686	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harriman, Frances	Yes
3687	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rule, Juliann	Yes
3688	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Marianne	Yes
3689	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Doug	Yes
3690	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blair, Clara	Yes
3691	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Knutsen, Karl	Yes
3692	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	maca, r	Yes
3693	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hook, Holly	Yes
3694	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Druding, Marie	Yes
3695	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dudey, Sherrie	Yes
3696	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Feldman, Tracy	Yes
3697	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kyse`, Barbara	Yes
3698	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Guest, Michael	Yes
3699	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kirkland, Jacqueline	Yes
3700	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Jack H.	Yes
3701	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilbreath, Shirley	Yes
3702	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Diehl, Marina	Yes
3703	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Rhett	Yes
3704	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haglind, Ron	Yes
3705	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kendall, Andrea	Yes
3706	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cantor, Francine	Yes
3707	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rubino, Christopher	Yes
3708	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henry, Vicki	Yes
3709	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	cevasco, john	Yes
3710	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Perry, Sharen	Yes
3711	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Paul, Gavin	Yes
3712	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Byron, Sharon	Yes
3713	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wehr, Paula	Yes
3714	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	WEST, PAUL	Yes
3715	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pankhurst, John	Yes
3716	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lamkin, Justin	Yes
3717	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parke, Kathryn	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3718	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	togashi, james	Yes
3719	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Traub, Susan	Yes
3720	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cross, Tara	Yes
3721	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bozarth, Alla	Yes
3722	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finch, Elizabeth	Yes
3723	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fortuank, Sharon	Yes
3724	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Torrey, Cynthia	Yes
3725	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tobias, David	Yes
3726	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Iverson, Rebecca	Yes
3727	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harcarik, Pat	Yes
3728	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goynes, Beverlee	Yes
3729	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Lancaster, Mitch	No
3730	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mac Kenzie, Mary	Yes
3731	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Even, MaryPaul	Yes
3732	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNamara, Catherine	Yes
3733	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loller, Richard	Yes
3734	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Herbert, P Sydney	Yes
3735	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Rick	Yes
3736	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howeth, Paula	Yes
3737	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tomko, Kim	Yes
3738	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stuyvesant, Fay	No
3739	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kriebel, Sally	Yes
3740	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drumright, Chris	Yes
3741	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kunz, Maggie	Yes
3742	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pavletic, Terrence	Yes
3743	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	White, Shirley	Yes
3744	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allen, Benjamin	Yes
3745	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeLucia, Rochelle	Yes
3746	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rindler, Joseph	Yes
3747	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crosby, Christine	Yes
3748	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Price, Nicole	Yes
3749	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moylan, Carrie Lynn	Yes
3750	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Chris	Yes
3751	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fleeman, Mark	Yes
3752	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Waugh, Dave	Yes
3753	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	White, Janet	Yes
3754	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haney, Erik	Yes
3755	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Riley, Juna	Yes
3756	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allen, Sundra	Yes
3757	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tweto, Steven	Yes
3758	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Culley, Joe	Yes
3759	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	turley, catherine	Yes
3760	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zellerman, Carin	Yes
3761	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	dair, gail	Yes
3762	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schnitzer, Maggey	Yes
3763	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woerner, Edwin	Yes
3764	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scena, Marian	Yes
3765	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fullerton, Nancy	Yes
3766	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Versaci, Loredana	Yes
3767	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelleher, Amy	Yes
3768	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maxfield, Richard	Yes
3769	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	eric, mauguy	Yes
3770	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prosperie, Johnnie	Yes
3771	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pasichnyk, Richard	Yes
3772	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Philos-Jensen, Diane	Yes
3773	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crowell, Kenneth	Yes

0008559

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3774	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	vickery, linda	Yes
3775	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D'Ambrosio, Lisa	Yes
3776	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dobson, Marily	Yes
3777	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bishop, William	Yes
3778	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Castro, Elizabeth	Yes
3779	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carroll, Dee	Yes
3780	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	LePore, Lodiza	Yes
3781	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	leek, theresa	Yes
3782	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, Debbie	Yes
3783	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fletcher, K	Yes
3784	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewandowski, Lesly	Yes
3785	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Broockmann, Dan	Yes
3786	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	David, carla	Yes
3787	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Applegate, Jonas	Yes
3788	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clothier, Suzette	Yes
3789	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	caira, wendy	Yes
3790	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hydeman, Jinx	Yes
3791	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	griffith, mike	Yes
3792	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garibay-Wynnberry, Rachel	Yes
3793	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kellett, Bess	Yes
3794	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolfe, Kathleen	Yes
3795	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donegan, Chuck	Yes
3796	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kriska, Richard	Yes
3797	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Guise, Karen	Yes
3798	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kegler, john	Yes
3799	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bradburn, mindy	Yes
3800	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Iudolphi, nicollette	Yes
3801	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schueler, Darlene	Yes
3802	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harvey, Mark & Judy	Yes
3803	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Perman, Vanessa	Yes
3804	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wyke, Kimberly	Yes
3805	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Guerrina, Jim	Yes
3806	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Herrmann, Patricia	Yes
3807	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chrissos, H.L. Chris	Yes
3808	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Check, Pamela	Yes
3809	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Amy	Yes
3810	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hildebrand, Judy	Yes
3811	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kraeszig, Jay	Yes
3812	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	goodman, Micah	Yes
3813	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Neil, Mary	Yes
3814	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	leffler, kay	Yes
3815	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reese, Rebecca	Yes
3816	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hudson, Summer	Yes
3817	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rothrock, Janet	Yes
3818	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kish, Marsha	Yes
3819	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martz, Edwin	Yes
3820	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lucaciu, Lidia	Yes
3821	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caldie, Cathy	Yes
3822	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sands, Kris	Yes
3823	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adomaitis, Colleen	Yes
3824	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolfanger, Tammy	Yes
3825	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Resk, Martha	Yes
3826	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goodwin, James	Yes
3827	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prouty, Vicki	Yes

0008560

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3828	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beckett, Caroline	Yes
3829	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Breimayer, Kathleen	Yes
3830	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scott, Tom	Yes
3831	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	iannacone, cynthia	Yes
3832	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cromwell, Susan	Yes
3833	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Killeen, Leah	Yes
3834	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kuykendall, Dana	Yes
3835	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3836	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fink, Dorothy	Yes
3837	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hamilton, Carol	Yes
3838	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cole, Sue	Yes
3839	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bassoff, Trina	Yes
3840	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sonoquie, Mo	Yes
3841	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dias, Hortense	Yes
3842	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	shibou, lilly	Yes
3843	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Riontino, Mary	Yes
3844	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yaskell, Tina	Yes
3845	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Humphrey, Jay	Yes
3846	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tuason, Ron	Yes
3847	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howie, Mary E	Yes
3848	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Montaine, Dorthea	Yes
3849	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnston, Cynthia	Yes
3850	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3851	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Jim	No
3852	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Borland, James S	No
3853	4/20/2010	No	Business	Rocky Mount Cord Co.	Bunn, Joe E	No
3854	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCabe, Keith D	No
3855	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tidd, Michele	No
3856	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Salimbene, Nicholas and Eve	No
3857	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Newbold, John and Sharon	No
3858	4/28/2010	No	Recreational Groups	North Carolina Beach Buggy Association	Oates, Tracey	No
3859	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dufour, Marc-Antoine	Yes
3860	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		RICHARDSON, HOOD	No
3861	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walden, Mary Lee S	Yes
3862	4/27/2010	No	Recreational Groups	North Carolina Beach Buggy Association	Saunders, Ron and Cecilia	No
3863	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shea, Jack	No
3864	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shea, Jack	No
3865	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		mckay, starr	No
3866	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3867	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Ernie	No
3868	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burke, Thomas P	No
3869	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McBane, Jeff	Yes
3870	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zacharias, Walter M	No
3871	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3872	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walker, Lewis and Ellen	No
3873	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wells, Robert C	No
3874	5/6/2010	No	Business	Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce	Tine, Paul N	No
3875	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wheless, Karen	No
3876	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burrus, Allen	No
3877	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burrus, Allen	No
3878	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		unknown, unknown	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3879	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, David G	Yes
3880	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goodwin, David	No
3881	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burrus, Jennifer	No
3882	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jordan, Lynn	No
3883	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cohen, Mary Ann	No
3884	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Griffin, Merrill T	No
3885	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Griffin, Merrill T	No
3886	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crowder, Jeff	Yes
3887	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keene, W James	No
3888	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gray, Gracie G	No
3889	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crowder, Jeff	Yes
3890	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Berry, Dr Michael A	No
3891	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Glen B	No
3892	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		unknown, unknown	No
3893	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mcleod, anita	Yes
3894	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DeSota, Patrick	No
3895	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dutton, Max	No
3896	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Larry	No
3897	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Jim	No
3898	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hodgeflex?, Alex	No
3899	4/27/2010	No	County Government	Dare County	Johnson, Mike	No
3900	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Joyner, David K	No
3901	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Latham, Judith C	No
3902	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lea, James W	No
3903	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	IKO	Mayberry, Randall	Yes
3904	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mc Cabe, Kevin	No
3905	4/17/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zacharias, Walter M	No
3906	4/21/2010	No	Business	The Cove Bed and Breakfast	Westervelt, Frederic and Ernestine	No
3907	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sharp, Bob and Becky	No
3908	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dorval, Fred	Yes
3909	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sharp, Bob and Becky	No
3910	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Medlin, Katie	No
3911	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jordan, Lynn B	No
3912	4/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hicks, Thomas	No
3913	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Andress, Ann	Yes
3914	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Runnels, Jack	Yes
3915	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		HARRIS, Scott W	No
3916	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Cary	Coles, Jay L	Yes
3917	4/16/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beeber, Alfred	No
3918	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Conlin, Jim	Yes
3919	5/6/2010	Master (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lauby, John A	No
3920	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Juergen	Yes
3921	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		newman, james a	No
3922	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wiley, Carol	Yes
3923	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lane, Hillary	Yes
3924	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gray, Thomas B	No
3925	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		AIKEN, JEFFREY K	No
3926	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hart, Linda K	No
3927	5/6/2010	Yes (426042)	Recreational Groups	Cape Hatteras Anglers Club	Montague, David O	Yes
3928	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Self, Carol D	Yes
3929	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blayer, Cynthia	Yes
3930	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Dorn, James	Yes
3931	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Hinkle, Alfred D	Yes
3932	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3933	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes

0008562

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3934	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ramsey, Jamie	Yes
3935	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cullen, Lawrence D	No
3936	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Watson, Ben	No
3937	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wahl, Mike	Yes
3938	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pratt, George W	No
3939	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nardi, Hana	Yes
3940	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cree, Ryan	Yes
3941	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Knaus, Harry R	Yes
3942	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rubbo, Deborah J	No
3943	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jacklyn, Angel	Yes
3944	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
3945	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parkinson, James E	No
3946	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Chris	Yes
3947	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Majoros, William	Yes
3948	4/30/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Coalition of National Park Service Retirees	Rettie, Dwight F	No
3949	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, Gergana	No
3950	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oden, Jane	No
3951	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Joos, Kevin R	No
3952	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Finley, Margaret and George	No
3953	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cafferty, Tim M	Yes
3954	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blevins, Terry	No
3955	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Laughon, Stuart B	No
3956	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rittenberg, JoAnne	No
3957	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lord, Elizabeth	Yes
3958	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elzinga, Judith	Yes
3959	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDaniel, Mary	Yes
3960	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Theye, Shelley	Yes
3961	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Buck, Kathleen	Yes
3962	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		szekeres, paul g	Yes
3963	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	motel owner	O'Neal, Joan A	No
3964	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Home Owner	Fries, John E	No
3965	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ellington, Linda M	No
3966	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
3967	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Poole, Edwin	Yes
3968	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Jeff	Yes
3969	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moffatt, Polly B	No
3970	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peele, Charles E	No
3971	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swanson, David T	No
3972	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Squamish Windsports Society	Cabiles, Karen	Yes
3973	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sommer, Sebastian	Yes
3974	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fort, Eddie A	No
3975	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Streinz, Donald F	No
3976	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yates, Jeffrey	No
3977	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tennant, Ruth	Yes
3978	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Santora, Marc	Yes
3979	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clark, Donna	Yes
3980	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heaning, Richard & Eileen	Yes
3981	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hunnewell, Sarah	Yes
3982	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mackay, Donald	Yes
3983	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bodine, Diane	Yes
3984	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zawaski, Joan	Yes
3985	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lees, Gretchen	Yes
3986	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taft, Ed	No

0008563

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
3987	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carroll, Glen	Yes
3988	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carr, Laurie	Yes
3989	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Livingston, Suzanne	Yes
3990	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mccune, s	Yes
3991	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yungclas, Allie	Yes
3992	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heid, Doreen	Yes
3993	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Casey, Kimberly	Yes
3994	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pico-ambrosio, Sofia	Yes
3995	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Balducci, Brian	Yes
3996	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilderman, Vicki	Yes
3997	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dorner, Charles	Yes
3998	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fresdti, Dana	Yes
3999	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Basham, Candice	Yes
4000	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Shelly	Yes
4001	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Futrell, Sherrill	Yes
4002	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simon, Richard	Yes
4003	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	henoch, frank	Yes
4004	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dodd, JoAnne	Yes
4005	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carroccia, Diana	Yes
4006	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McRae, Michele	Yes
4007	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kleber, Tracey	Yes
4008	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gagomiros, Keith	Yes
4009	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, susan	Yes
4010	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walters, Jim	Yes
4011	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vogelman, Diane	Yes
4012	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yackel, Amy	Yes
4013	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Souza, Michael	Yes
4014	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fordham, Lisa	Yes
4015	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cooper, Isabella	Yes
4016	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	o'neill, carri	Yes
4017	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oldenkamp, Ricki	Yes
4018	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kamberos, Patrick	Yes
4019	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heidenfelder, Randy	Yes
4020	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goldstein, Judith	Yes
4021	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ostrer, Allison	Yes
4022	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buchner, Scott	Yes
4023	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Torino, Don	Yes
4024	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frances, Esther	Yes
4025	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alex, Deann	Yes
4026	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Binner, Lisa	Yes
4027	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bente, Lynn	Yes
4028	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Markowitz, Rose	Yes
4029	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Collings, Dustin [Shane]	Yes
4030	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	raulinitis, audra	Yes
4031	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weatherman, John	Yes
4032	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wesley, F. Robert	Yes
4033	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, David J.	Yes
4034	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Illusion, Aleata	Yes
4035	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hansen, Than	Yes
4036	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cassidy, Leslie	Yes
4037	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Videbaek, Bente	Yes
4038	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Sullivan, Joseph	Yes
4039	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, William	Yes
4040	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woveris, Kathy	Yes
4041	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vosburgh, Victoria	Yes
4042	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crouch, Gray	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4043	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	shelton, charles	Yes
4044	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bolman, Diane	Yes
4045	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zahller, Guy	Yes
4046	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hart, Margaret	Yes
4047	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Jan	Yes
4048	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lexy, Linda	Yes
4049	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carpinelli, Lou	Yes
4050	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bartell, Ann	Yes
4051	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mybeck, Mark	Yes
4052	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bender, Laurie	Yes
4053	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bordeaux, Len	Yes
4054	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weagly, Nancy	Yes
4055	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Markham, Barbra	Yes
4056	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seaborg, David	Yes
4057	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	TERRELL, WALTER	Yes
4058	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gianni, P	Yes
4059	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Artin, Thomas	Yes
4060	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dupps, John	Yes
4061	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilder, Jenny	Yes
4062	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curtis, Lisa	Yes
4063	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taylor, Red	Yes
4064	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dragovich, Martha & Peter	Yes
4065	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCall, Wm.	Yes
4066	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Christine	Yes
4067	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marzolf, Cindy	Yes
4068	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hirt, Melissa	Yes
4069	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parkin, Jason	Yes
4070	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young, David	Yes
4071	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	CLIPKA, MIKE	Yes
4072	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kemm, Dennis	Yes
4073	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mains, Robert	Yes
4074	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Deutermann, Katy	Yes
4075	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rogers, Donald G.	Yes
4076	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harper, Rebecca	Yes
4077	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chesnutt, Judy	Yes
4078	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	NELSON, ZACHARY	Yes
4079	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Metcalf, Mary Beth	Yes
4080	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	amiad, emma	Yes
4081	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Krakov, Jessica	Yes
4082	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hughes, gabi	Yes
4083	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Krupinski, K	Yes
4084	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lotz, Judith	Yes
4085	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mason, evelyn	Yes
4086	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Slaney, Edward	Yes
4087	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanders, Robert	Yes
4088	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hague, George	Yes
4089	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Freidberg, Stan	Yes
4090	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gardner, Kyle	Yes
4091	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rinaldo, Arlene	Yes
4092	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bundy, Jennifer	Yes
4093	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Balitzer, Mark	Yes
4094	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	gomez, mike	Yes
4095	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	G. Fisher, David	Yes
4096	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meyer, Ellen	Yes
4097	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weeden, Noreen	Yes

0008565

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4098	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Langlois, Elaine	Yes
4099	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boruta, Martyna	Yes
4100	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parris, Brandy	Yes
4101	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Silver, MD, Daniel	Yes
4102	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ponsor, Mark	Yes
4103	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garon, Lenore	Yes
4104	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gleason, Mindy	Yes
4105	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Abel, Darryl	Yes
4106	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Becker, Harold	Yes
4107	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pockell, Norman	Yes
4108	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seastone, Star	Yes
4109	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	spence, kathryn	Yes
4110	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cozart, Johann	Yes
4111	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wallace, Anne	Yes
4112	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davidson, D.	Yes
4113	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Handen, Cynthia	Yes
4114	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nemeth, Nicole	Yes
4115	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shaffer-Koros, Carole	Yes
4116	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gaylor, Linda	Yes
4117	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crane, Mark	Yes
4118	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hooley, John	Yes
4119	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Franck, Faith	Yes
4120	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mortellito, Nina	Yes
4121	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Petrakis, Chris	Yes
4122	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murphy, Lesley	Yes
4123	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ross, Judith	Yes
4124	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carson, Carolyn	Yes
4125	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Montalbano, Chris	Yes
4126	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	melora, carolann	Yes
4127	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Draper, Tom	Yes
4128	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marceron, Dennis	Yes
4129	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	duman, bonnie	Yes
4130	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Serra, Dawn	Yes
4131	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bloom, Stephen & Michele	Yes
4132	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jinkerson, Guyton	Yes
4133	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Nancy	Yes
4134	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Eliza	Yes
4135	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Osborne-Smith, Andrew	Yes
4136	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanify, Tim	Yes
4137	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tanner, Joseph	Yes
4138	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greenwood, Jim	Yes
4139	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Guse, Kevin	Yes
4140	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bishop, Jennifer	Yes
4141	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kerhulas, Theodore	Yes
4142	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mahoney, Linda	Yes
4143	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Dale	Yes
4144	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stradling, Geoff	Yes
4145	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coulson, Susan	Yes
4146	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dreyfuss, Meri	Yes
4147	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rufo, Maggie	Yes
4148	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zimmer, Arlene	Yes
4149	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hilliard, Patricia	Yes
4150	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Patrick, Richanna	Yes
4151	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ungar, Ruth	Yes
4152	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morgan, Linda	Yes

0008566

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4153	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edmonds, Teresa	Yes
4154	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ellyn, Maura	Yes
4155	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Muul, Kersti	Yes
4156	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Doner, Leslee	Yes
4157	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Glaser, Donald A.	Yes
4158	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lind, Britt	Yes
4159	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dietrich, Cathe	Yes
4160	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Paraszewski, Joseph	Yes
4161	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Potter, Michele Leslie	Yes
4162	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Abbott, Leanne	Yes
4163	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ketcherside, Sharon	Yes
4164	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Newman, Erica	Yes
4165	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chin, Andrea	Yes
4166	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seiler, Douglas	Yes
4167	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rubel, Scott	Yes
4168	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weilage, Krystal	Yes
4169	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dodge, Christopher	Yes
4170	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ausman, Emma	Yes
4171	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCullough, Laura	Yes
4172	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cush, Marjory	Yes
4173	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goldman, Kristin	Yes
4174	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wisner, Robert	Yes
4175	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siegel, Ann	Yes
4176	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bonvouloir, Al	Yes
4177	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NC Beach Buggy Assoc.	Madre, Jeffrey C	Yes
4178	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dobson, Tony	Yes
4179	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bonner, Lawrence	Yes
4180	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hollett, John	Yes
4181	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brady, Patricia	Yes
4182	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	healy, molly	Yes
4183	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jaime, Tina	Yes
4184	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mellon, Mary Lou	Yes
4185	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoag, Eric	No
4186	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Warner, Kelley	Yes
4187	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roberts, Jennifer	Yes
4188	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oldershaw, Susan	Yes
4189	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Matlock, KL	Yes
4190	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rothenberger, Elisabeth	Yes
4191	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	keyishian, sarah	Yes
4192	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heidelberger, Ellen	Yes
4193	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shaw, Donald	Yes
4194	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schuchart, Lawrence	Yes
4195	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Collins, Gary	Yes
4196	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ellenberger, David	Yes
4197	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cook, Maria	Yes
4198	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goldsmith, Jason	Yes
4199	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ankrom, Lowell	Yes
4200	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Janett, Gina C.	Yes
4201	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brewer, Richard	Yes
4202	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ciccarone, Joan	Yes
4203	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Doyle, Laurance	Yes
4204	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roberts, Ed	Yes
4205	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Midgett, Lovie O'Neal	No
4206	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Foodim, Stanley	Yes
4207	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeMichele, Natalee	Yes
4208	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, tricia	Yes

0008567

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4209	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haus, Dwayne	Yes
4210	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marotto, Philip D	Yes
4211	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kuyper, Kathy	Yes
4212	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	liu, sandy	Yes
4213	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Markowitz, Saul	Yes
4214	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Marcine	Yes
4215	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Townsager, Mary	Yes
4216	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lyons, Glenn	Yes
4217	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koprowicz, Kent	Yes
4218	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Pat	Yes
4219	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ladwig, Laurel	Yes
4220	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wallace, Matt	Yes
4221	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sollis, Todd	Yes
4222	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caffrey, Frank	Yes
4223	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walters, Sheryl	Yes
4224	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Karen	Yes
4225	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Griffith, Gloria	Yes
4226	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greenberg, Bert	Yes
4227	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Emerson, Margaret	Yes
4228	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carlson, Rita	Yes
4229	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Molloy, Molly	Yes
4230	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hamer, Suzanne	Yes
4231	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lospalluto, Steve	Yes
4232	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alkins, William	Yes
4233	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miano, Janice	Yes
4234	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stangler, Douglas	Yes
4235	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, Madeline	Yes
4236	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Friedman, Mitchell	Yes
4237	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roessler, Leonie	Yes
4238	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Snider, Louise	Yes
4239	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walker, Paula	Yes
4240	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peck, Allen	Yes
4241	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wathen, Wayne	Yes
4242	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Charles	Yes
4243	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maslanek, Michael	Yes
4244	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barnard Jr, Charles	Yes
4245	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marquis, Dortha	Yes
4246	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leaper, Sandra	Yes
4247	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	croasdale, alan	Yes
4248	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bennigson, Barbara	Yes
4249	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Borman, Heather	Yes
4250	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morgan, Steven	Yes
4251	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wulf, Sylvia	Yes
4252	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nancy DorianDorian, Nancy	Yes
4253	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	goldstein, carol	Yes
4254	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schultz, Lorenz & Barbara	Yes
4255	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Babbitt, Susan	Yes
4256	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	White, Marianne	Yes
4257	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Foley, Mary	Yes
4258	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frost, Chris	Yes
4259	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Matejcek, Patricia	Yes
4260	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schwartz, Suzanne	Yes
4261	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ferreira, jeanine	Yes
4262	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cree, Ian	Yes

0008568

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4263	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	burkhalter, erika	Yes
4264	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alexander, J.	Yes
4265	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jackson, Lisa	Yes
4266	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hirsch, Rifka	Yes
4267	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Der Wende, Sharon	Yes
4268	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rebman, Diana	Yes
4269	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hampton, Susan	Yes
4270	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Farkas, Nolan	Yes
4271	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Corpolongo, Roger	Yes
4272	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sawyer, Mary Ruth	Yes
4273	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caiano Correia, Cecilia	Yes
4274	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Romero, Claudia	Yes
4275	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Best, Brenda	Yes
4276	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Correia, Cecilia	Yes
4277	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Powers, Cynthia	Yes
4278	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Atkinson, Erin	Yes
4279	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Stu	Yes
4280	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Casey, Leslie	Yes
4281	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seeley, Marsha	Yes
4282	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Marv	Yes
4283	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wheller, Noreen	Yes
4284	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	reynolds, gibson	Yes
4285	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young, Frederick J.	Yes
4286	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNamara, Eileen	Yes
4287	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blowers, Anne	Yes
4288	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pierpont, Claudia	Yes
4289	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Chet	Yes
4290	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Jim	Yes
4291	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Madson, Cindy	Yes
4292	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cohen, Pamela	Yes
4293	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ishisaka, Joanne	Yes
4294	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Beth	Yes
4295	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Vikki	Yes
4296	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Canoyer, Jill	Yes
4297	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cantrell, Ann	Yes
4298	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moffatt-Mosaad, Adrienne	Yes
4299	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	turano, marie	Yes
4300	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schafer, Helen	Yes
4301	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gwinn, Anita	Yes
4302	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chaney, Trish	Yes
4303	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williamson, Shawn	Yes
4304	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grant, Gordon	Yes
4305	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fordham, Chad	Yes
4306	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bagnoli, Connie	Yes
4307	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tignanelli, Doreen	Yes
4308	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Shelley	Yes
4309	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kothari, Sheila	Yes
4310	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gunther, Peter	Yes
4311	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sahami, Yasmin	Yes
4312	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graham, John	Yes
4313	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pahl, Carol	Yes
4314	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sperling, Linda	Yes
4315	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swanner, John	Yes
4316	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peterson, Kimberly	Yes
4317	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanders, John	Yes

0008569

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4318	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Flanagan, Carol	Yes
4319	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tennefoss, Lynn	Yes
4320	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aguilera, Marco	Yes
4321	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barto, Diane	Yes
4322	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Werner, Kirstyn	Yes
4323	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stewart, Sandy	Yes
4324	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pasternack, Ellen	Yes
4325	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crunkleton, Elaine	Yes
4326	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hammett, Jan	Yes
4327	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wieland, Chuck	Yes
4328	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klahr, Paul	Yes
4329	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dunne, Loretta	Yes
4330	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Calvanico, Linda	Yes
4331	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Landis-Hanna, Amanda	Yes
4332	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lear, kirsten	Yes
4333	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henry, Jan	Yes
4334	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Eileen	Yes
4335	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Michael	Yes
4336	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brosius Jr, Robert	Yes
4337	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wagner, Elaine	Yes
4338	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murphy, Patrick	Yes
4339	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mason, M.	Yes
4340	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ryals Tamm, Sharon	Yes
4341	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heinold, Christian	Yes
4342	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	landskroner, ron	Yes
4343	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shibata, Hidemichi	Yes
4344	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Norman, Gina	Yes
4345	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones-Umberger, Stanley	Yes
4346	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Rosalind	Yes
4347	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frank, Brooks	Yes
4348	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Freed, Michael	Yes
4349	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hritz, Clifford	Yes
4350	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parekh, Jai	Yes
4351	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rothstein, Richard	Yes
4352	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rotcher, Michael	Yes
4353	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Houten, Maxwell	Yes
4354	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hammermeister, Lisa	Yes
4355	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sloan, kim	Yes
4356	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alderman, Elizabeth	Yes
4357	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barnes, Nancy	Yes
4358	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacob, Carla	Yes
4359	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kanemori, C.	Yes
4360	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	meehan, w	Yes
4361	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mains, Marc	Yes
4362	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rodger, Colleen	Yes
4363	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Osman, Kristen	Yes
4364	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beaudoin, Susan	Yes
4365	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gross, Eileen	Yes
4366	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Poole, Patricia	Yes
4367	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Rob	Yes
4368	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harding, Heather	Yes
4369	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rigatti, Karen	Yes
4370	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seigel, Alison	Yes
4371	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lynn, Rhonda	Yes
4372	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	A. Star, Relf	Yes
4373	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scollins, Wendy	Yes

0008570

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4374	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klug, Frank	Yes
4375	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mathews, Peter	Yes
4376	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rochester, Kristen	Yes
4377	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Shirley	Yes
4378	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Ken	Yes
4379	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morton, Barbara	Yes
4380	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crespi, Paul	Yes
4381	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNeill, Susan	Yes
4382	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Callard, Diane	Yes
4383	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walls, Susan	Yes
4384	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Falcone, Janet	Yes
4385	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reynolds, Kyle	Yes
4386	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Raider, Phil	Yes
4387	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	eich, jack	Yes
4388	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fishman, Ted	Yes
4389	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strauss, Sara	Yes
4390	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fogarty, Dan	Yes
4391	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pastorino, Bondy	Yes
4392	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lust, Jennifer	Yes
4393	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henry, William	Yes
4394	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rothstein, Richard	Yes
4395	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	johnson, stephen	Yes
4396	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tove, Michael	Yes
4397	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D., Liz	Yes
4398	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Calise-Simmons, Loretta	Yes
4399	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seltzer, Rob	Yes
4400	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kirks, James	Yes
4401	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mcclure, annie	Yes
4402	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nicholas Picard, Mary	Yes
4403	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Connelly, Ned	Yes
4404	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brook, Kristine	Yes
4405	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hocking, Laura	Yes
4406	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	James, Lorren	Yes
4407	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Federman, Larry	Yes
4408	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stephens, James	Yes
4409	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seltzer, Margaret	Yes
4410	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bowling, Lori	Yes
4411	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dressler, Robert	Yes
4412	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
4413	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Browning, H L	No
4414	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
4415	5/6/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Deane, Michael J	No
4416	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
4417	5/6/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hults, David E	No
4418	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
4419	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stone, William G	No
4420	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	izworski, norbert & Rae	Yes
4421	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly, William	Yes
4422	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Jan	Yes
4423	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mills, Chris	Yes
4424	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murphy, Debra	Yes
4425	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davies, Paul	Yes
4426	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Bianca	No
4427	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gonta, Marianne	Yes
4428	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilmerding, Susan	Yes

0008571

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4429	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gish, Wendy	Yes
4430	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Krach, Judy	Yes
4431	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	phillips, claire	Yes
4432	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	OGLE, MADELINE	Yes
4433	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grutz, Emeli	Yes
4434	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edwards, Gerald	Yes
4435	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Okazaki, Yoshie	Yes
4436	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parker, J. T.	Yes
4437	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weinstein, Diane	Yes
4438	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hines, Ann	Yes
4439	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sutton, Jarred	Yes
4440	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	kardaszkeski, nanette	Yes
4441	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Lewis, Jack D	No
4442	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haire, John	Yes
4443	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeRogatis, Dana	Yes
4444	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scoville, Pam	Yes
4445	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Barbara	Yes
4446	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maurer, John H	Yes
4447	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	KASPRZYK, STEVE	Yes
4448	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Archuleta, Martha	Yes
4449	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Stacey	Yes
4450	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	warner, martha	Yes
4451	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garber, Marc	Yes
4452	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Banta, Lynne	Yes
4453	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boone, Lisa	Yes
4454	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sherman, Arnette	Yes
4455	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parnell, Kristine	Yes
4456	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Emily	Yes
4457	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kieffer, Ramsay	Yes
4458	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hayden, Jeannine	Yes
4459	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Babst, Christina	Yes
4460	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Demo, Sarah	Yes
4461	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	George, Ed	Yes
4462	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mcginn, chris	Yes
4463	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vallario, Sal	Yes
4464	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	London, Ellin	Yes
4465	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	spar, jon	Yes
4466	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hamilton, Robert	Yes
4467	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myers, Robert	Yes
4468	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barbone, Shannon	Yes
4469	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Breckenridge, John	Yes
4470	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Potts, Graeme	Yes
4471	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rosenthal, Jennifer	Yes
4472	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Rita	Yes
4473	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allen, L	Yes
4474	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chapman, Charles	Yes
4475	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanson, Art	Yes
4476	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spoerl, Joan	Yes
4477	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Toumasis, Julia	Yes
4478	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mortensen, Linda	Yes
4479	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ford, Rebecca	Yes
4480	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coulter, Alan	Yes
4481	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Slauson, Kevin	Yes
4482	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Melodie	Yes
4483	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Comstock, Carolyn	Yes
4484	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Worley, Joseph	Yes

0008572

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4485	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	campbell, brenda	Yes
4486	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taddie, J.	Yes
4487	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grant, Jane	Yes
4488	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Monmouth County Audubon Society, Linda Mack, Trustee	Yes
4489	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	johnson, erik	Yes
4490	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kline, Simon	Yes
4491	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dougherty, Shannon	Yes
4492	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, Priscilla	Yes
4493	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Riviello, Donald	Yes
4494	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Massey, Eileen	Yes
4495	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dressel, Lucrucia	Yes
4496	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	millette, karin	Yes
4497	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	LeClercq, Ann	Yes
4498	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weinstein, Joseph	Yes
4499	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curtis, Marnelle	Yes
4500	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bender, Edward	Yes
4501	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fox, Joanne	Yes
4502	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Montapert, Anthony	Yes
4503	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klimczak, Gloria	Yes
4504	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Teel, Mary	Yes
4505	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanson, Carol	Yes
4506	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNeeley, John	Yes
4507	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Mary	Yes
4508	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moore, Craig	No
4509	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Layman, Sharon A	Yes
4510	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Farris, Nona	Yes
4511	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sabetto, Nick	Yes
4512	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	deHerrera, Alicia	Yes
4513	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leonard, Betsy A	Yes
4514	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	palmour, rhonda	Yes
4515	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McMullen, Gail	Yes
4516	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coe, Caroline	Yes
4517	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Turk, Patricia	Yes
4518	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Capaldi, Alex	Yes
4519	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kerr, Celia	Yes
4520	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	rodriguez, joan	Yes
4521	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fletcher, Kevin	Yes
4522	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Noneman, Greg	Yes
4523	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Nowell	Yes
4524	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Capaldi, Mindy	Yes
4525	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stoneman, Josh	Yes
4526	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swagerty, Lydia	Yes
4527	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Melander-Dayton, Adele	Yes
4528	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stein, Howard	Yes
4529	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hartman, Catherine	Yes
4530	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanchez, Tom	Yes
4531	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mone, Carol	Yes
4532	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brand, Jeffrey	Yes
4533	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Daven, Viana	Yes
4534	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duran, Janet	Yes
4535	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ayres, Eugene	Yes
4536	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Luginbuhl, Gerry	Yes
4537	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	michlewicz, michelle	Yes
4538	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Affleck, Aldona	Yes

0008573

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4539	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Levin, Jon	Yes
4540	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robson, James	Yes
4541	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rodriguez, Carmen	Yes
4542	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Beveren, Chris	Yes
4543	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brennan, John	Yes
4544	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reinys, Jean	Yes
4545	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brothag, Patty J	Yes
4546	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Genin, Merideth	Yes
4547	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henderson, Jane	Yes
4548	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Shirley	Yes
4549	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Norried, Lisa	Yes
4550	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peltz, Christopher	Yes
4551	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cashetto, Joanne	Yes
4552	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Knowles, Rob	Yes
4553	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pfeifer, Pamela	Yes
4554	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heidemann, Kathleen	Yes
4555	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	raines, michael	Yes
4556	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	graham, george	Yes
4557	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Daniel, Marinell	Yes
4558	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burke, Carol	Yes
4559	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Landeo, Eva	Yes
4560	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aiello, Grace	Yes
4561	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dilling, Brock	Yes
4562	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, MD, Elisabeth	Yes
4563	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Onasch, Otto	Yes
4564	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Patumanoan, Nancy	Yes
4565	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keller, Anne Marie	Yes
4566	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Velasco, Steven	Yes
4567	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Clark	Yes
4568	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haggard, Alan	Yes
4569	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wheaton, Marsha	Yes
4570	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	smith, susan	Yes
4571	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bruff, Astra	Yes
4572	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Flewitt, Claire	Yes
4573	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cullen, Dale	Yes
4574	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keating-Secular, Karen	Yes
4575	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Felt, BJ	Yes
4576	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clark, Carol	Yes
4577	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stopa, Martha	Yes
4578	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bell, Sharon	Yes
4579	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murphy, Carolyn	Yes
4580	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schnugg, Mary	Yes
4581	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Landstrom, Peter S	Yes
4582	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McSpadden, Celeste	Yes
4583	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drake, Suzanne	Yes
4584	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Troetschler, Ruth	Yes
4585	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Neral, David	Yes
4586	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jarboe, JoLynn	Yes
4587	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kazdan, David	Yes
4588	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Suzuki, Lorraine	Yes
4589	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	kriegler, bertha	Yes
4590	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boddy, Claire	Yes
4591	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adams, Judi	Yes
4592	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stradtman, George	Yes
4593	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oliver, Jo	Yes
4594	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carnahan, Marge	Yes

0008574

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4595	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	leitch, mary	Yes
4596	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Buren, Diana	Yes
4597	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Amand, Wilbur	Yes
4598	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ruthruff, Linda	Yes
4599	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barst, Jennifer	Yes
4600	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scheuermann, Karen	Yes
4601	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Kevin	Yes
4602	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Masley, Mike	Yes
4603	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lynn, Andy	Yes
4604	5/6/2010	Yes (422899)	Unaffiliated Individual	Homeowner	Lingsch, Steve C	No
4605	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fumarolo, Michael	Yes
4606	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Altieri, Angela	Yes
4607	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yeh, Stephen	Yes
4608	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jennings, Joe	Yes
4609	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lennon, Deborah	Yes
4610	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Slattery, Leda	Yes
4611	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chavez, Phyllis	Yes
4612	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walther, Regina	Yes
4613	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elliott, Janice	Yes
4614	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Banner, Gideon	Yes
4615	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ryder, Michelle	Yes
4616	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stein, Herbert	Yes
4617	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stiefel, Ray	Yes
4618	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keir, Alex	Yes
4619	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jensen, Cindy	Yes
4620	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alpert, Jeanne	Yes
4621	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kulesza, Joan	Yes
4622	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heilman, Arthur	Yes
4623	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barnett, Ann	Yes
4624	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nagy, Sarah	Yes
4625	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, Pamela	Yes
4626	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reifke, Kathleen	Yes
4627	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Acosta, Salvador	Yes
4628	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sidoti, George	Yes
4629	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Phillips, Marilyn	Yes
4630	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schreiber, Barbara	Yes
4631	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barclift, Dawn M.	Yes
4632	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vanderleelie, Roy	Yes
4633	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Panko, Drew	Yes
4634	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Berroll, Philip	Yes
4635	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peters, Kevin	Yes
4636	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCabe, Rita	Yes
4637	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
4638	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		HUBBARD-TOMPKINS, LAURA L	No
4639	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burke, Denise	No
4640	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kulik, Pamela	Yes
4641	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Towner, Jerry	Yes
4642	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wallace, VR	Yes
4643	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gmeiner, Mary Sue	Yes
4644	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ruggiero, Nikki	Yes
4645	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Britton, Michael and Pam	Yes
4646	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pendze, Irene	Yes
4647	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Knapp, Angela	Yes
4648	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Calhoun, Charles	Yes

0008575

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4649	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kennedy, Pat	Yes
4650	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meier, Tim	Yes
4651	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schroeder, T.L.	Yes
4652	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Casale, Frank	Yes
4653	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	toner, william	Yes
4654	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woods, Debbie	Yes
4655	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jackson, Kevin	Yes
4656	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goode, Michael	Yes
4657	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sindelar, Geo	Yes
4658	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Heather	Yes
4659	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wojcik, susan	Yes
4660	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNichol, Ken	Yes
4661	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dolins, Merelyn	Yes
4662	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shinnock, Jack	Yes
4663	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Molitoris, Marty	Yes
4664	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Citrone, Andrew	Yes
4665	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Price, Norma	Yes
4666	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fellows, Leslie	Yes
4667	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eubank, Lynn	Yes
4668	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Margaret	Yes
4669	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	fennessy, ed	Yes
4670	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dayer, Anne	Yes
4671	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	chapman, carlynn	Yes
4672	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Slote, Karen	Yes
4673	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pasichnyk, Daniel	Yes
4674	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	York, Traci	Yes
4675	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ryan, Susan	Yes
4676	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pendleton, Marianne	Yes
4677	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Arkin, Jay	Yes
4678	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jervis, Thomas	Yes
4679	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cowan, Connie	Yes
4680	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hall-Suter, Josamine R.	Yes
4681	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	milller, melissa	Yes
4682	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sturtevant, Judy	Yes
4683	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pihlak, Linda	Yes
4684	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	spak, Margaret	Yes
4685	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Selof, Everett	Yes
4686	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Becker, Barbara	Yes
4687	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allison, Diane	Yes
4688	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Milburn, Jan	Yes
4689	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barry, Marilyn	Yes
4690	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Machare, Enrique	Yes
4691	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tyrpa, Joseph	Yes
4692	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hernandez, Anita	Yes
4693	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Melnik, Hana	Yes
4694	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kochis, Jim	Yes
4695	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Osborne, Kevin	Yes
4696	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robey, Steve	Yes
4697	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Letourneau, Oliver	No
4698	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robertson, David H	Yes
4699	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Nate E	Yes
4700	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Levy, Jay	No
4701	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moser, Gregory	Yes
4702	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gerlach, Trudy	Yes
4703	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vanhook, Jessica	Yes
4704	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mazrimas-ott, christy	Yes

0008576

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4705	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGrane, Guy	Yes
4706	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Griebeler, Andrew	Yes
4707	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sinkler, Edward	Yes
4708	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Nancy	Yes
4709	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Korman, Scott	Yes
4710	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young, Elaine	Yes
4711	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zalek, Jean	Yes
4712	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blair, Floy	Yes
4713	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gordon, Brenda	Yes
4714	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sullivan, Gayatri	Yes
4715	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	goldstein, roz	Yes
4716	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McRae, Laura	Yes
4717	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bland, Laura	Yes
4718	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schwartz, Karen	Yes
4719	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Evans, Michael W	Yes
4720	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cannata, Mary Lou	Yes
4721	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ford, Julie	Yes
4722	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Elaine	Yes
4723	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Erb, Jay	Yes
4724	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lindner, Matthew	Yes
4725	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Sickle, Krae	Yes
4726	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D., Liz	Yes
4727	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Larsen, Karen	Yes
4728	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stephens, Sharon	Yes
4729	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ortman, Nancy	Yes
4730	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Nicholas	Yes
4731	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly, Nancy	Yes
4732	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aslam, Nayeem	Yes
4733	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reynolds, Thomas	Yes
4734	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Preston, Lorrie	Yes
4735	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Metsch, Sharon	Yes
4736	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Denardo, Cynthia	Yes
4737	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keiser, John L.	Yes
4738	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jannarone, Kimberly	Yes
4739	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stevens, Nike	Yes
4740	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gallagher, Sarah	Yes
4741	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walter, Dixie	Yes
4742	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Michelle	Yes
4743	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hult, Philip	Yes
4744	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bardwell, Elizabeth	Yes
4745	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elzinga, Jill	Yes
4746	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lynch, Dennis	Yes
4747	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NC Beach Buggy Assn	Sloop, James H	Yes
4748	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wussler, imasprinter@cox.net	Yes
4749	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Munguia, Reinier	Yes
4750	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	katoozian, ali	Yes
4751	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strand, Barbara	Yes
4752	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	dickenson, pj	Yes
4753	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	GREEN, BONNIE	Yes
4754	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Samaan, Sarah	Yes
4755	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leino, Amber	Yes
4756	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Springer, Ryan	Yes
4757	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sandy, Michael	Yes
4758	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Volling, Kathleen	Yes
4759	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robbins, Mary	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4760	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brewer, Mary	Yes
4761	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morency, Jeanne	Yes
4762	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith-Remick, Donna	Yes
4763	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dufficy, Joe	Yes
4764	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Verner, Gill	Yes
4765	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sandvig, Renee	Yes
4766	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murray, David	Yes
4767	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Robert	Yes
4768	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McClung, John	Yes
4769	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lacey, SharonLynne	Yes
4770	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Catone, Anna	Yes
4771	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heard, Little Sun S.	Yes
4772	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bugliarelli, Diane	Yes
4773	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bowman, Jason	Yes
4774	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graham, Naomi	Yes
4775	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seiler, James	Yes
4776	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Landis, Dana	Yes
4777	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Basnar, Lee	Yes
4778	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robie, Stephen	Yes
4779	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hopson, David	Yes
4780	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brazis, Christine	Yes
4781	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haney, Sue	Yes
4782	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kieval, Shena	Yes
4783	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	llamas, I	Yes
4784	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Witmer, Philip	Yes
4785	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Malina, Matthew	Yes
4786	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clark, Jean	Yes
4787	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carter, Jeff	Yes
4788	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sota, C.Daniel	Yes
4789	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kvaas, Robert	Yes
4790	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	yagid, joy	Yes
4791	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nickle-Haslam, Lovena	Yes
4792	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ramsey, Elizabeth	Yes
4793	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zook, Daisy	Yes
4794	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Phillips, Glenn	Yes
4795	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hernandez, Yadira	Yes
4796	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Howell, Steve T	Yes
4797	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fitch, James H.	Yes
4798	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barbutti, Patricia	Yes
4799	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bearns, Mel	Yes
4800	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Templin, John	Yes
4801	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Porter, Leroy	Yes
4802	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cassady, Calvin and Vicki	Yes
4803	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Markowitz, Susan	Yes
4804	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	abell, martha	Yes
4805	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crocker, Sharon	Yes
4806	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shank, Lisa	Yes
4807	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finlayson, Kate	Yes
4808	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	walters, wendy	Yes
4809	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baier, Mary Ann	Yes
4810	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ruch, Denise	Yes
4811	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Feinblatt, Joe & Pepi	Yes
4812	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoff, Michelle	Yes
4813	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Campbell, Patricia	Yes

0008578

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4814	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ring, Catherine	Yes
4815	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Webb, Victoria	Yes
4816	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taylor, Patricia	Yes
4817	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Black, Karina	Yes
4818	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Emory, Robert	Yes
4819	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanchez, Charmain	Yes
4820	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	walker, nancy	Yes
4821	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Archer, Ph.D., E. James	Yes
4822	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Voorhies, Eric	Yes
4823	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Faber, Megan	Yes
4824	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Serrato, Luanne	Yes
4825	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lima, Christopher	Yes
4826	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Freedman, Paula	Yes
4827	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bast, Chris	Yes
4828	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, Michael	Yes
4829	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeMillion, Frances	Yes
4830	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Manning, Carl	Yes
4831	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McManus, Tanya	Yes
4832	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Karges, Robert	Yes
4833	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gabriel, Sara	Yes
4834	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	cawthorn, karen	Yes
4835	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Foulise, Kathy	Yes
4836	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	blair, gary	Yes
4837	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lee, Summer	Yes
4838	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grantham, Danny	Yes
4839	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Liebowitz, Barbara	Yes
4840	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stewart, Christopher	Yes
4841	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Audrey J.	Yes
4842	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stucki, Elizabeth	Yes
4843	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mead, Caroline	Yes
4844	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	WILSON, TODD	Yes
4845	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scranton, Ms.Elizabeth	Yes
4846	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brower, Amelia	Yes
4847	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ramos, Carolina	Yes
4848	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hairgrove, Kelly	Yes
4849	5/6/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steiner, Joyce	Yes
4850	5/6/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual	Palmetto State bassmaster	Gibson, Michael I	Yes
4851	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	apoa	baine, robert b	Yes
4852	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thacker, Lindsay	Yes
4853	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clarke, Burnetta	Yes
4854	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cataldo, Lexie	Yes
4855	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bergman, simona	Yes
4856	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	davis, pat	Yes
4857	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Webster, Dan	Yes
4858	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peterson, Jay	Yes
4859	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McKnight, Shoshanah	Yes
4860	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Huber, Linda	Yes
4861	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGovern, Thomas	Yes
4862	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilde, R.L.	Yes
4863	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graham-Gardner, Rosemary	Yes
4864	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Liggio, Robert	Yes
4865	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cooper, Richard	Yes
4866	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Biser, James	Yes
4867	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Joba, Jane	Yes
4868	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rowe, Anne	Yes

0008579

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4869	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cook, Judy	Yes
4870	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edwards, Jeri	Yes
4871	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sonies, Barbara	Yes
4872	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gillett, Mike	Yes
4873	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gannon, Patricia	Yes
4874	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hebron, Theresa	Yes
4875	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SPECTOR, SARAH	Yes
4876	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saltzer, Bruce	Yes
4877	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Field, Linda	Yes
4878	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cotton, Kimberly	Yes
4879	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McKibben, Ann	Yes
4880	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rudolph, Ana	Yes
4881	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wichar, Denis Markian	Yes
4882	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Turkot, Patricia	Yes
4883	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDonald, Autumn	Yes
4884	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robinson, Marcia	Yes
4885	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marsh, Glenn	Yes
4886	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Landau, John	Yes
4887	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shimata, Kathy	Yes
4888	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harpole, Thane	Yes
4889	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sullivan, Brian	Yes
4890	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morales, Henrietta	Yes
4891	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Larson, Brian	Yes
4892	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stuart, Anne	Yes
4893	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lundgren Jr, Roger	Yes
4894	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	BROWN, LORA	Yes
4895	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ahearn, Dennis	Yes
4896	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGarry, Brendan	Yes
4897	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strain, Maryann G.	Yes
4898	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hardin, Susan	Yes
4899	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kegler, Lori	Yes
4900	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kemish, Arthur	Yes
4901	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Townsend, Carlos	Yes
4902	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shiels, Theresa	Yes
4903	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanson, Natalie	Yes
4904	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Severs, Scott	Yes
4905	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolf, Rachel	Yes
4906	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, John	Yes
4907	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vandaveer, Jeanine	Yes
4908	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bonetti, Donna	Yes
4909	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gietzen, Sheri	Yes
4910	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hipkins, William	Yes
4911	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spotts, Richard	Yes
4912	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	knickerbocker, jenna	Yes
4913	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Carolee	Yes
4914	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Takaht, Cynthia	Yes
4915	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meyer, Edie	Yes
4916	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Robert	Yes
4917	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ache, Paulette	Yes
4918	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schramm, Beatrix	Yes
4919	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Antonia	Yes
4920	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	CAPPIELLO, MARY	Yes
4921	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lealuez, Marie	Yes
4922	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	veraldi, anne	Yes
4923	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zelasko, Sandy	Yes
4924	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Slade, Kenneth	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4925	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Carol	Yes
4926	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bea, Gary	Yes
4927	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adams, Beverly	Yes
4928	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keeney, Sharon	Yes
4929	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Nancy	Yes
4930	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mushkat, Mark	Yes
4931	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rubin, Michael	Yes
4932	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoyt, Patricia	Yes
4933	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Long, David	Yes
4934	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seider, John	Yes
4935	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carson, Catherine	Yes
4936	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allen, Anne	Yes
4937	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McHenry, Steve	Yes
4938	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tomczyszyn, Michael	Yes
4939	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCarty, Michael	Yes
4940	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pierce, Deborah	Yes
4941	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moynihan-Simon, Mary	Yes
4942	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prouflis, Jaye	Yes
4943	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fredsti, Lisa	Yes
4944	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Linebarger, Charles	Yes
4945	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Byers, Eleanor	Yes
4946	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fontanez, Damian	Yes
4947	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	gritsch, maria	Yes
4948	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hedges, Ken	Yes
4949	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nahmias, Victor	Yes
4950	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	trouve, monique	Yes
4951	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	karlson, fred	Yes
4952	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jorgensen, James H.	Yes
4953	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chirillo, James	Yes
4954	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Iverson, Steve	Yes
4955	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vanden Dungen, Simone	Yes
4956	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frank, Lee	Yes
4957	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGowan, Michael	Yes
4958	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kinney, Douglas	Yes
4959	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nerelli, Terry	Yes
4960	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robin, Lois	Yes
4961	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gee, Lisa	Yes
4962	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peterson, Stanley	Yes
4963	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tyler, Steve	Yes
4964	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lobel, Colleen	Yes
4965	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Carolyn	Yes
4966	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cockle, Thomas	Yes
4967	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Orcholski, Gerald	Yes
4968	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tomsky, Andy	Yes
4969	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Placone, Richard	Yes
4970	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Polesky, Alice	Yes
4971	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Casner, Sonya L	Yes
4972	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dillon, Barbara	Yes
4973	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reese, Ellen	Yes
4974	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frasieur, Forest	Yes
4975	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nelson, Dency	Yes
4976	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curtis, Richard	Yes
4977	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rummelt, Herman	Yes
4978	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McMurdo, Prem	Yes
4979	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	case, barb	Yes
4980	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Riesenburger, Regina	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
4981	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Webb, Dean	Yes
4982	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McBride, Ellen	Yes
4983	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wexler, marly	Yes
4984	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peachey, Joanne	Yes
4985	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Flicker, Mary	Yes
4986	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Person, Donald	Yes
4987	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elms, Laurie	Yes
4988	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drechsler, Anna	Yes
4989	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wood, Joyce	Yes
4990	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bailey, brenda	Yes
4991	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goodman, Samantha	Yes
4992	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curriu, Bena	Yes
4993	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	STENI, DARWIN	Yes
4994	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frascella, Carole	Yes
4995	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baumann, Alan and Janet	Yes
4996	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Askren, Mark	Yes
4997	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Capotorto, Jeanette	Yes
4998	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shen, Salliane	Yes
4999	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	brunson, bob	Yes
5000	5/7/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	ddd	Lazzara, Marco	Yes
5001	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Aircraft Owners and Pilots Assoc	Apenis, Robert	Yes
5002	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sinal, H. Jean	Yes
5003	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hittinger, maggie	Yes
5004	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weiner, Jordan	Yes
5005	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peterson, Robert	Yes
5006	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Katz, David	Yes
5007	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	White, Mindi	Yes
5008	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kennedy, Kyle	Yes
5009	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Michalik, Victor	Yes
5010	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoffman, Thomas	Yes
5011	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Borie, Edith	Yes
5012	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Szabo, Joseph	Yes
5013	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grego, John M	No
5014	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Basir, Schantz	Yes
5015	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hartel, Gale	Yes
5016	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nerode, Gregory	Yes
5017	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frey, Andrew	Yes
5018	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thorpe, Dale	Yes
5019	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Mary Beth	Yes
5020	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Randolph, Dee	Yes
5021	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Danos, Rebecca	Yes
5022	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davenport, James R	Yes
5023	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stalcup, Lee	Yes
5024	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Farace, Felicia	Yes
5025	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stewart, John	Yes
5026	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Martin, Karen	Yes
5027	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carballo, Carla	Yes
5028	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schlaufman, Donna	Yes
5029	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jones, Ellen	Yes
5030	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mønsted Larsen, Lisbeth	Yes
5031	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miles, Chris	Yes
5032	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jones, Patricia	Yes
5033	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mayer, Andreas	Yes

0008582

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5034	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hale, Michele	Yes
5035	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hoot, Lois	Yes
5036	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Elizabeth	Yes
5037	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clark, Evan	Yes
5038	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sines, Maria	Yes
5039	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vollmer, Ann	Yes
5040	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bean, Debra	Yes
5041	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Anderson, Jane	Yes
5042	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Snyder, WhiteHawk	Yes
5043	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hudson, Jeffrey	Yes
5044	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mulligan, Reed	Yes
5045	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	van gelderen, tamsyn	Yes
5046	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gouldmann, James	Yes
5047	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Castaneda-Mendez, Kicab	Yes
5048	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	levine, lee	Yes
5049	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wagner, Sharon	Yes
5050	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Powell, Elise	Yes
5051	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harwood, Richard	Yes
5052	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Murray, Claire	Yes
5053	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harris, Rodney	Yes
5054	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kalan, S	Yes
5055	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dudley, Ward	Yes
5056	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kennedy, Sharon	Yes
5057	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Madden, Susanne	Yes
5058	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cooley, Charles	Yes
5059	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Collins, Janet	Yes
5060	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weeks, Cynthia	Yes
5061	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gaffney, Patrick	Yes
5062	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dyke, Delores	Yes
5063	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	thompson, Liz	Yes
5064	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hulse, Drew	Yes
5065	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pluskowski, Nina	Yes
5066	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	BENEFIELD, JULIANNA	Yes
5067	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Skyrud, Jerome	Yes
5068	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stave, Gregg	Yes
5069	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Landwehr, Torsten	Yes
5070	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Paul	Yes
5071	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ford, Betty	Yes
5072	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wolford, John	Yes
5073	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	liverett, phyllis	Yes
5074	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Riddle, Elizabeth	Yes
5075	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Solbes, Ester	Yes
5076	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moorman, Cristina	Yes
5077	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Minnich, Suzanne	Yes
5078	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Knox, Patti	Yes
5079	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Alexander, Charles	Yes
5080	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Woods, Debbie	Yes
5081	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tunis, Joy	Yes
5082	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	miller, lawrence	Yes
5083	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friedman, Seth	Yes
5084	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Firth, Richard	Yes
5085	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schumann, Russell	Yes
5086	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schaefer, Scott	Yes
5087	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Swierczewski, Sheila	Yes
5088	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weeks, Kay	Yes

0008583

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5089	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Albert, Marcus	Yes
5090	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Flora, David	Yes
5091	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schwab, Matthew	Yes
5092	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Madison, Maria	Yes
5093	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Good, Elizabeth	Yes
5094	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henry, Mallika	Yes
5095	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		West, Karen C	No
5096	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		West, Danny L	Yes
5097	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		West, Corben R	Yes
5098	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barlow, Todd M	Yes
5099	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		West, Cody R	Yes
5100	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chumley, Nancy	No
5101	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Morgan, Marisa	Yes
5102	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vasudevan, Erin	Yes
5103	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	G, B	Yes
5104	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Park, Carla	Yes
5105	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Goode, Pam	Yes
5106	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Krieger, Patti	Yes
5107	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Alvarez, Maria	Yes
5108	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hocking, Connor	Yes
5109	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Young, Carla	Yes
5110	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Beach, Rhonda	Yes
5111	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rose-Lofty, Margaret-Jane	Yes
5112	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mueller, Diane	Yes
5113	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Iacone, Randy	Yes
5114	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Frey, Alexandra	Yes
5115	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Desomer, Heather	Yes
5116	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sheriff, Patti	Yes
5117	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McNeil, Ashby	Yes
5118	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lofurno, Michael	Yes
5119	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Anderson, Cynthia	Yes
5120	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Teel, Wayne	Yes
5121	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bunch, Joanne	Yes
5122	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dinyari, John	Yes
5123	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Spanos, Carol	Yes
5124	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	SEIDENBERG, ANTHONY	Yes
5125	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fullerton, Richard	Yes
5126	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Probst, Shirley	Yes
5127	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Patterson, Alice	Yes
5128	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harrison, Christine	Yes
5129	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barker, Donald	Yes
5130	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harris, Kathy	Yes
5131	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wilson, Gina	Yes
5132	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Forbes, Claudia	Yes
5133	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mathiss, Barb	Yes
5134	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walters, Heather	Yes
5135	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meade, Deb	Yes
5136	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dow, David	Yes
5137	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lamberg, Suzanne	Yes
5138	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Doerr, James E	No
5139	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leighton, Timothy	Yes
5140	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gould, Burnham	Yes
5141	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clark, Sherry	Yes
5142	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fuller, Jeff	Yes
5143	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Merims, Leila	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5144	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ragland, Andrew	Yes
5145	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hogge, Heather	Yes
5146	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fraytet, Jules	Yes
5147	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mauldin, Heather	Yes
5148	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garbe, Alanna	Yes
5149	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hertzler, Amy	Yes
5150	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harry, Brucie	Yes
5151	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Aronova, Maria	Yes
5152	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hollis, Melissa	Yes
5153	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jones, Dustin	Yes
5154	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kilpatrick, Sheila	Yes
5155	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lucas, Rosemary	Yes
5156	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thompson, Kathy	Yes
5157	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mize, Judith	Yes
5158	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schauer, William	Yes
5159	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	miller, claire	Yes
5160	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Black, Roger	Yes
5161	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jacobs, John	Yes
5162	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Larivey, Dan	Yes
5163	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Larsen, Cynthia	Yes
5164	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Taylor, Mikel	Yes
5165	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Derosa, Mariana	Yes
5166	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dhillon, Margaret	Yes
5167	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zakrzewska, Monika	Yes
5168	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Hare, Josephine	Yes
5169	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Avey, Vikki	Yes
5170	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burrows, Matthew	Yes
5171	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Emilia Ausere	Yes
5172	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Trimm, James	Yes
5173	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wiesenburg, Ann	Yes
5174	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Page, Danny	Yes
5175	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Egeli, Carolyn	Yes
5176	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	M, Elizabeth	Yes
5177	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lineberry, Martha	Yes
5178	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hapner, Donna	Yes
5179	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stratton, Bob	Yes
5180	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bill, Theresa	Yes
5181	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	White, Melissa	Yes
5182	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ellis, Dani	Yes
5183	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Umberger, Amy	Yes
5184	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cook, Eleanor	Yes
5185	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shephard, Jill	Yes
5186	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Blohme, Robert	Yes
5187	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Panella, Ruth	Yes
5188	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ruiz, Antonio	Yes
5189	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Loechner, Karen	Yes
5190	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clarke, Suzanne	Yes
5191	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nunez, Gabriella	Yes
5192	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Townson, victoria	Yes
5193	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Palacios, Am	Yes
5194	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hochheiser, Harry	Yes
5195	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	pruitt Friend of Defenders, ernest	Yes
5196	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hebert, Jeanne	Yes
5197	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Green, Meredith	Yes

0008585

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5198	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garrett, Mary	Yes
5199	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Parsons, Kenneth	Yes
5200	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zuk, Dennis	Yes
5201	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McClung, Judy	Yes
5202	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hartsfield, Susan	Yes
5203	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Martucci, Janet	Yes
5204	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bartlett, Mary	Yes
5205	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bolt, Patricia	Yes
5206	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lippert, Timothy	Yes
5207	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McLoughlin, Susan	Yes
5208	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Overbeck, Robert	Yes
5209	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Debi	Yes
5210	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saenger, Peter	Yes
5211	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	trice, tina	Yes
5212	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilde, Genevieve	Yes
5213	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ziober, Dennis J	Yes
5214	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seymour, Stephanie	Yes
5215	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	shelton, Keith	Yes
5216	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
5217	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mensing, Patricia	Yes
5218	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Aden, Marty	Yes
5219	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Abdu, Abrehet	Yes
5220	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Karneckis, Susan	Yes
5221	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gustafson, Peter	Yes
5222	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Denisesr, Alfred	Yes
5223	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gawricki, Brenda	Yes
5224	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Norr, Treva	Yes
5225	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Perrero, Deborah	Yes
5226	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thorne, Terry	Yes
5227	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fraser, Evelyn	Yes
5228	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	culbreth, penny	Yes
5229	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rocha Fontes, Manuel	Yes
5230	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nicolino, Jill	Yes
5231	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gustin, Rose	Yes
5232	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brady, Kathy	Yes
5233	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Roberts, Karen	Yes
5234	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Doiron, Jennifer	Yes
5235	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garcin, Mary	Yes
5236	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ascherl, Christian	Yes
5237	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Williams, Yvonne	Yes
5238	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Potter-Degrey, Laura	Yes
5239	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mathieson, Teresa	Yes
5240	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Landry, Jennifer	Yes
5241	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cunningham, Storm	Yes
5242	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schmidt, James	Yes
5243	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ibrahim, Camellia	Yes
5244	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Drembus, Joel	Yes
5245	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shelton, Charles	Yes
5246	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burmeister, Maiya	Yes
5247	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mitchell, Heather	Yes
5248	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Godbold, Leslie	Yes
5249	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Martin, Stephany	Yes
5250	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cooper, Isabella	Yes
5251	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Favazza, Joanne	Yes
5252	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Flanagan, Haywood	Yes
5253	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mallard, Steve	Yes

0008586

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5254	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scott, Theresa	Yes
5255	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Conca, Natalie	Yes
5256	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hunter, Vernon	Yes
5257	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wasserman, Barbara	Yes
5258	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Evans, C	Yes
5259	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kenner, Jessica	Yes
5260	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mitchell, Laura	Yes
5261	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Townsend, Teresa	Yes
5262	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tugman, Gwen	Yes
5263	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pannullo, Linda	Yes
5264	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vande Kemp, Hendrika	Yes
5265	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Landenberger, Elke	Yes
5266	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Davis, John	Yes
5267	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	mcclaren, jane	Yes
5268	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Roberts, Donna	Yes
5269	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hirt, Deborah	Yes
5270	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Grmoja, Ivana	Yes
5271	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Green, Michelle Erica	Yes
5272	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harris, Natalie	Yes
5273	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dutrow, Del	Yes
5274	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, boyd	Yes
5275	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Voris, Helen	Yes
5276	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Short, Joan	Yes
5277	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ojala, Jami	Yes
5278	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hoff, Val	Yes
5279	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bashen, Melinda	Yes
5280	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carroll, Sue	Yes
5281	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sawyer, Richard	Yes
5282	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Adams, Brenda	Yes
5283	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gingerich, Catherine	Yes
5284	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Juliet	Yes
5285	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gifft, Shirley	Yes
5286	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burnett, Deborah	Yes
5287	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tucker, Jessica	Yes
5288	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ciampa, Linda	Yes
5289	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Condron, Katrina	Yes
5290	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Anthonyaltar, Charles	Yes
5291	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stepp, Brenda	Yes
5292	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Waldroup, Kerry	Yes
5293	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caudill, Walter L	Yes
5294	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ronshagen, Robert	Yes
5295	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parr, Mark	Yes
5296	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morrow, Cheryl	Yes
5297	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bryant, Donald	Yes
5298	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wells, carolyn	Yes
5299	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carricato, John	Yes
5300	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	monroe, kristina	Yes
5301	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kurz, Don	Yes
5302	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Saferoad	Ivanov, George V	Yes
5303	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thalheimer, N/A	Yes
5304	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mendelsohn, Martin	Yes
5305	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Borchelt, Beth	Yes
5306	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pierce, Ann	Yes
5307	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dudley, Erin	Yes

0008587

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5308	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vanek, Marianne	Yes
5309	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coling, Marcia	Yes
5310	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Deal, Betty	Yes
5311	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gray, Roberta	Yes
5312	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jernell, Cynthia	Yes
5313	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vosik, Tom	Yes
5314	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Downs, Charles	Yes
5315	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kirby, Robin	Yes
5316	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garten, Michael	Yes
5317	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dickenson, Marie	Yes
5318	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Green, Ellen	Yes
5319	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carey, Cynthia	Yes
5320	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schrader, Wanda	Yes
5321	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Oryshkevich, Larissa	Yes
5322	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Myslinski, David	Yes
5323	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Herwig, Gary	Yes
5324	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wargo, Kerry	Yes
5325	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schmahl, Patrick	Yes
5326	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Simone, Louise	Yes
5327	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schaffer, Maik	Yes
5328	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kuenning, Jennifer	Yes
5329	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	English, Doug	Yes
5330	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stone, William	Yes
5331	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Naporano, Pamela	Yes
5332	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dedes, Matthew	Yes
5333	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jay, Fay	Yes
5334	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sidwell, Cheryl	Yes
5335	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mattocks, Destini	Yes
5336	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cook-Stroud, Cathy	Yes
5337	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ann, Kt	Yes
5338	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Winther, Jacqueline	Yes
5339	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Goodwin, Hill	Yes
5340	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Owens, Jonathan	Yes
5341	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Blum, Laura	Yes
5342	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Welms, James	Yes
5343	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ciccarelli, Gloria	Yes
5344	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Daiss, Becky	Yes
5345	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	English, Phyllis	Yes
5346	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mummert, Kim	Yes
5347	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Filacchione, Irene	Yes
5348	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kotte, Robyn	Yes
5349	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reid, Katherine	Yes
5350	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barone, melinda	Yes
5351	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Williams, Michael	Yes
5352	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Baker, Carol	Yes
5353	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barnett, Nancy	Yes
5354	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Foster, Michael	Yes
5355	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rubino, Matthew	Yes
5356	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Aschbrenner, Renee	Yes
5357	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Kathryn	Yes
5358	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Page, Joel	Yes
5359	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reifschneider, Marie-Louise	Yes
5360	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Roig, Cheyrl	Yes
5361	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tucker, Ira	Yes
5362	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Melchiors, Jessica	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5363	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Price, Tracy	Yes
5364	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thompson, Linda	Yes
5365	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scott, Pauline	Yes
5366	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Conkrite, Karina	Yes
5367	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gipson, Carl	Yes
5368	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clark, Michele	Yes
5369	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dorosin, Harvey	Yes
5370	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Blanding, India	Yes
5371	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Selby, Lisa	Yes
5372	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garbett, Ann	Yes
5373	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wolf, Gretchen	Yes
5374	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Groft Strojny, Morgan	Yes
5375	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bart, Kristina	Yes
5376	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Perez, Rosa	Yes
5377	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	King, Andrea	Yes
5378	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McClellan, Beth	Yes
5379	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McCoy, Yvette	Yes
5380	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pitts, Ann	Yes
5381	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brandmeyer, Jo Ellen	Yes
5382	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cyrill, Janice	Yes
5383	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coleman, Bob	Yes
5384	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	mcdermott, jeff	Yes
5385	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Penaranda, Elizabeth	Yes
5386	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hugill, Anne	Yes
5387	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Parks, Denise	Yes
5388	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carr, Marilyn	Yes
5389	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hagood, Hap	Yes
5390	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shipe, Mary	Yes
5391	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whitmire, Jerry and Bonnie	Yes
5392	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Matkins, Arlene	Yes
5393	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gooch, Susan	Yes
5394	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Goetcheus, Grace	Yes
5395	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Godfrey, Terri	Yes
5396	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Decker, D	Yes
5397	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Landenberger, Elke	Yes
5398	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly, kathleen	Yes
5399	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Randolfi, Anita	Yes
5400	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ryan, Therese	Yes
5401	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finger, Corey	Yes
5402	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scheyer, Marguerite	Yes
5403	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ungar, Elizabeth	Yes
5404	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Talarico, Jennifer	Yes
5405	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dietze, Clem	Yes
5406	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burdick, Becky	Yes
5407	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hall, Suzanne	Yes
5408	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garone, Frank	Yes
5409	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Olson, Larry	Yes
5410	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cicccone, Christopher	Yes
5411	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Juknialis, Barbara	Yes
5412	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Phillips, Patricia	Yes
5413	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Georgalis, Margalith	Yes
5414	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ginos, Joanne	Yes
5415	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Richard L.	Yes
5416	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hazel, James	Yes
5417	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanna, Mary	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5418	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dressler, Kristen	Yes
5419	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morris, Kathleen	Yes
5420	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDowell, Sheridan	Yes
5421	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marcy, Ruth	Yes
5422	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		bricks, Georg	No
5423	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Resnik, Robert	Yes
5424	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Henry, Kathryn	Yes
5425	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Macpherson, Mark	Yes
5426	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Donahue, Vivian	Yes
5427	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nordenholz, Karen	Yes
5428	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barton, Yvonne	Yes
5429	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Adams, Amy	Yes
5430	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Good, Rob	Yes
5431	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mason, Alan	Yes
5432	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cranford, J.	Yes
5433	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Price, Robert	Yes
5434	5/7/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	OMalley, Elaine	Yes
5435	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Levitt, Lacey	Yes
5436	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	SANLAVUN, SAWATDEE	Yes
5437	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nord, Randall	Yes
5438	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Graves, Mark	Yes
5439	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hauck, Molly	Yes
5440	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	White, Elizabeth	Yes
5441	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mitchell, Mackenzie	Yes
5442	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wright, Paul	Yes
5443	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Behling, Dawn	Yes
5444	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	MacDougall, Anna	Yes
5445	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barnes, Linda	Yes
5446	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jones, Greg	Yes
5447	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Parcells, Julie	Yes
5448	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pennello, Stephani	Yes
5449	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wanseriend of Defenders, Heather	Yes
5450	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Livingston, Susan	Yes
5451	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hoke, Carol	Yes
5452	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tinnel, Martha	Yes
5453	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stavish, Ed	Yes
5454	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bat-haee, Fariba	Yes
5455	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jenrette, Richard	Yes
5456	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sawicki, Joseph	Yes
5457	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Selaya, Anne	Yes
5458	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Atherton, Heather	Yes
5459	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Callis, Cecile	Yes
5460	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	ROTHFUS, CONNIE	Yes
5461	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Lila	Yes
5462	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Finger, Sherry	Yes
5463	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Houske, Marcia	Yes
5464	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Napps, Shirley	Yes
5465	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Robertson, Pam	Yes
5466	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boone, Carol	Yes
5467	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Foister, Cathy	Yes
5468	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Atchison, Karen	Yes
5469	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miskelly, John	Yes
5470	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boprey, Molly	Yes
5471	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Deborah	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5472	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, N	Yes
5473	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boger, Tonoua	Yes
5474	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pikolas, Anne	Yes
5475	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bryan, Judith	Yes
5476	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Williams, Octavia	Yes
5477	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Roane, Mandy	Yes
5478	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hausler, Jennifer	Yes
5479	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Apperson, Robert	Yes
5480	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Neil, Steve	Yes
5481	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gentry, Greg	Yes
5482	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, William	Yes
5483	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rowan, David	Yes
5484	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Ronald	Yes
5485	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	DeCoursey, Jane	Yes
5486	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elson, Judy	Yes
5487	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kirker, Christopher	Yes
5488	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lewis, William	Yes
5489	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lowrance, Lawsonhenry	Yes
5490	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Parianous, Steven	Yes
5491	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mager, Mike	Yes
5492	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Bobbi	Yes
5493	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Heady, Janna	Yes
5494	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Forsyth, L	Yes
5495	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ritchie, John	Yes
5496	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dunlap, Denise	Yes
5497	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Silberfarb, Elaine	Yes
5498	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hendrian, Rachel	Yes
5499	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Eldridge, Manuel	Yes
5500	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tarleton, Patrick	Yes
5501	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garcia, Elizabeth	Yes
5502	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shade, Constance	Yes
5503	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bosserman, Ian	Yes
5504	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mason, Cindy	Yes
5505	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cacopardo, Stephanie	Yes
5506	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chippie, Kelly	Yes
5507	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	russell, mel	Yes
5508	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sutphin, Randy	Yes
5509	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rosa, Raquel	Yes
5510	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vogel, Fran	Yes
5511	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Clara	Yes
5512	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	King, Erin	Yes
5513	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rich, Al	Yes
5514	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Paterni, Josh	Yes
5515	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Platenyk Myers, Kelly	Yes
5516	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Oliver, Whitney	Yes
5517	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Mary	Yes
5518	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Van Horn, Jonathan	Yes
5519	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Andrus, Rebecca	Yes
5520	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Krebs, Jim	Yes
5521	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Currier, Vaughn	Yes
5522	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wittstadt, Kurt	Yes
5523	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	D'Costa, Juanita	Yes
5524	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carrier, Patricia	Yes
5525	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ward, Susan	Yes
5526	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sloan, Sheila	Yes

0008591

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5527	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Alippe, Lorraine	Yes
5528	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ring, Lara	Yes
5529	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Daniel	Yes
5530	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Campbell, Linda	Yes
5531	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moredock, Amy	Yes
5532	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fishman, Akiva	Yes
5533	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Alpert, Peggy	Yes
5534	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stravinsky, Patti	Yes
5535	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Goetzke, Rebecca	Yes
5536	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bowersox, Heather	Yes
5537	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Morseth, Sandra	Yes
5538	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Skinner, Edwin	Yes
5539	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Williams, Lindy	Yes
5540	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Piampiano, Eileen	Yes
5541	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henne, William	Yes
5542	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buteau, Gail	Yes
5543	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	May, Melissa	Yes
5544	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roane, Mandy	Yes
5545	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nussbaum, Bessie	Yes
5546	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vasily, Karen	Yes
5547	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dalla, John	Yes
5548	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Flowers, Bobbie	Yes
5549	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Udell, Eric	Yes
5550	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Birinyi, Gigi	Yes
5551	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tioran, J.	Yes
5552	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walter, Janet Jo	Yes
5553	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ruhlow, David A	Yes
5554	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harmon, Thomas	Yes
5555	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fenimore, Cynthia	Yes
5556	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frauman, Thomas	Yes
5557	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Holly	Yes
5558	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grim, Debra	Yes
5559	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Berger, Dennis	Yes
5560	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fischer, Robbie	Yes
5561	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tollman, L	Yes
5562	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gibbs, Denise	Yes
5563	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ransom, Jill	Yes
5564	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Vicki	Yes
5565	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	glackin, christina	Yes
5566	5/7/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Moran, Lawrence	Yes
5567	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Krementowski, Laura J	Yes
5568	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, sonja	Yes
5569	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burke, Terri	Yes
5570	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Robinson, Howard	Yes
5571	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McElheny, Barbara	Yes
5572	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Webster, Dorothy	Yes
5573	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Michele	Yes
5574	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reiser, Katharyn	Yes
5575	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stallings, Steve	Yes
5576	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fish, Vivian	Yes
5577	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Olliges, Jackie	Yes
5578	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tanaka, Elizabeth	Yes
5579	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sartoris, Elizabeth	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5580	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wilkinson, Kelley	Yes
5581	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kuhn, Tamra	Yes
5582	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fahman, Cheryl	Yes
5583	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hicks, Kathy	Yes
5584	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Keith, Donna	Yes
5585	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leonard, Jacquelyn	Yes
5586	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lautemann, Robin	Yes
5587	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jackson, Richard	Yes
5588	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	West, Tom	Yes
5589	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bernier, Denise	Yes
5590	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moore, Frank	Yes
5591	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Connell, David	Yes
5592	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Powell, Nicole	Yes
5593	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stoudenmire, Barbara	Yes
5594	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Michelucci, Cristina	Yes
5595	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tana, David	Yes
5596	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Main, Michael	Yes
5597	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dollyhigh Gardner, Adrienne	Yes
5598	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Romine, Lori	Yes
5599	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dee, Robin	Yes
5600	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tuttle, Rn Bsn Ccm, Laurie	Yes
5601	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Alexander, Robert	Yes
5602	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mirchandani, Gitu	Yes
5603	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lane, Michelle	Yes
5604	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Watters, Kate	Yes
5605	5/7/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brown, Kristin	Yes
5606	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	ochis, adrienne	Yes
5607	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cobb, Felicia	Yes
5608	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clairmont, Kelly	Yes
5609	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bottari, Vito	Yes
5610	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miller, Bill	Yes
5611	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Irwin, John	Yes
5612	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coleman, Dan	Yes
5613	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	King, Vickie	Yes
5614	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moore, Nancy	Yes
5615	5/7/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mason, Kit	Yes
5616	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Travers, Rose	Yes
5617	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chachula Jr, Julian	Yes
5618	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mctyre, Kelley	Yes
5619	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mericle, Susan	Yes
5620	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Beeson, Christina	Yes
5621	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pippenger, Ruth	Yes
5622	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scher, Arnold	Yes
5623	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Scott	Yes
5624	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bruszewski, Michelle	Yes
5625	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mazzarella, Rebecca	Yes
5626	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hild, Sandra	Yes
5627	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bond, Elena	Yes
5628	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Glenn, Rosemarie	Yes
5629	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Puliselic, Chris	Yes
5630	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Jason	Yes
5631	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kennedy, Ashley	Yes
5632	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Channell, Vicky	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5633	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Golden, Tara	Yes
5634	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	DuPre, Carole	Yes
5635	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gary, Ed	Yes
5636	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Curtis, Cynthia	Yes
5637	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burrell, Kathy	Yes
5638	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Williams, Linda	Yes
5639	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Apodaca, Gale	Yes
5640	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lutz, Anita	Yes
5641	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Knopf, Alexander	Yes
5642	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Polissky, Jodi	Yes
5643	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McKinney, Holly	Yes
5644	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zuckerman, Bonnie	Yes
5645	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scheckler, Rebecca	Yes
5646	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wood, Peter	Yes
5647	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harrison, Marilyn	Yes
5648	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pattenden, Penelope	Yes
5649	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gumm, Amber	Yes
5650	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Matthews, Ellen	Yes
5651	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Suchanek, Astrid	Yes
5652	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Winter, Doretta	Yes
5653	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hock, Timothy	Yes
5654	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jones, Janelle	Yes
5655	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boardman, Mandie	Yes
5656	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Carolyn	Yes
5657	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kemper, Thomas	Yes
5658	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Phillips, Joyce	Yes
5659	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nicholson, Jessica	Yes
5660	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Byrd, LuElla	Yes
5661	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scott, Graham	Yes
5662	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Duncan, Bryan	Yes
5663	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boyce, Stacy	Yes
5664	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Folkes, June	Yes
5665	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rose, Katie	Yes
5666	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Buscemi, Donna	Yes
5667	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rutherford, Collette	Yes
5668	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dworkin, Mona	Yes
5669	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moose, Bruce	Yes
5670	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shematek, Judith	Yes
5671	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Julie	Yes
5672	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Goodwin, Hilary	Yes
5673	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Van Gilder, Lynn	Yes
5674	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Doheney, Jennifer	Yes
5675	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Osborn, Dorothy	Yes
5676	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Amy	Yes
5677	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stevens, Jennifer	Yes
5678	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sundland, David	Yes
5679	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	suchanek, astrid	Yes
5680	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elliott, Carol	Yes
5681	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Andrade, Kimberly	Yes
5682	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Luman, Trudy	Yes
5683	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bailey, Lynne	Yes
5684	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leary, Meredith	Yes
5685	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McNally, Christine	Yes
5686	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sullivan, MaryClare	Yes
5687	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lane, Bronwyn	Yes

0008594

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5688	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, L.C.	Yes
5689	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Morris, Melissa	Yes
5690	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boyer, Jayne	Yes
5691	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sedwick, Dixie	Yes
5692	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Souto, David	Yes
5693	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mager, Marlowe	Yes
5694	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kirkland, Molly	Yes
5695	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Murrill, Linda	Yes
5696	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Desmith, John	Yes
5697	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lipka, Rebecca	Yes
5698	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carroll, Lisa	Yes
5699	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hatrgrove, Keith	Yes
5700	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greenberg, Lenore	Yes
5701	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gosnell, Evelyn	Yes
5702	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	TANSON, VONGRAT	Yes
5703	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rhoads, Ann	Yes
5704	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schlossberg, Donna	Yes
5705	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Szoke, Dorothy	Yes
5706	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Butcavage, Lorena	Yes
5707	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	gillono, mark	Yes
5708	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barden, Larry	Yes
5709	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bailey, Judith	Yes
5710	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sanders, jeffrey	Yes
5711	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kleinrichert, Jennifer	Yes
5712	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	vanstrien, r	Yes
5713	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pelc, Jason	Yes
5714	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, BettyJean	Yes
5715	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weiman, Rick	Yes
5716	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shaffer-O'Connell, Melissa	Yes
5717	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lyon, Anne	Yes
5718	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Randall, Kelly	Yes
5719	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Socolar, Samuel	Yes
5720	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coffman, Kathy	Yes
5721	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	poli, marylou	Yes
5722	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fitzsimmons, Donald	Yes
5723	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howell, Jack	Yes
5724	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Silver, Ira	Yes
5725	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ehlers, Lynne	Yes
5726	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Norden, Michael	Yes
5727	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Disher, David	Yes
5728	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buckalew, Claudia	Yes
5729	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D'Onofrio, Adam	Yes
5730	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lasek, patricia	Yes
5731	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Szczepanski, Linda	Yes
5732	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taracido, Amy	Yes
5733	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cole, Patrice	Yes
5734	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Dossenbach, Robert	No
5735	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Besier, Gwen	Yes
5736	5/7/2010	No	State Government	N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission	Fish, Nancy D	No
5737	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coleman, Valarie	Yes
5738	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brayton, Eli	Yes
5739	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Partington, Leigh	Yes
5740	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mattis, Jason	Yes
5741	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Purrell, Richard	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5742	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sepanski, Joan	Yes
5743	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Felver, Rachel	Yes
5744	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Anselmo, Allison	Yes
5745	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McMullen, Conor	Yes
5746	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gortney, Melanie	Yes
5747	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pettway, Beverly	Yes
5748	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sinnes, Andrew	Yes
5749	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ruggles, Beth	Yes
5750	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Retzlaff, Carole	Yes
5751	5/7/2010	Master (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Day, Michelle	Yes
5752	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Edwards, Misty	Yes
5753	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hall, Robin	Yes
5754	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reppucci, N. Dickon	Yes
5755	5/7/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McDonald, Noreen	Yes
5756	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Larkin, Christy	Yes
5757	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Erwin, Michael	No
5758	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McGarvey, Gerald	Yes
5759	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stabler, Courtney	Yes
5760	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harlow, Caleb	Yes
5761	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bell, Jody	Yes
5762	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Connors, Kelly	Yes
5763	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weed, Jacqueline	Yes
5764	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McCoy, Andrew	Yes
5765	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harkrader, Deborah	Yes
5766	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Neice, Jill	Yes
5767	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hardy, Gayle	Yes
5768	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ley, Debora	Yes
5769	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bowman, Stacy	Yes
5770	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kubalek, Sandra	Yes
5771	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Peterman, Amy	Yes
5772	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brown, Susan	Yes
5773	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stilwell, Tom	Yes
5774	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Katz, Kay	Yes
5775	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hulick, Victoria	Yes
5776	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Olson, Mary	Yes
5777	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Muradyan, Ani	Yes
5778	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dreyer, Jennifer	Yes
5779	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sequeira, Margaret	Yes
5780	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sumner, Jean	Yes
5781	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	DiLorenzo, Leslie	Yes
5782	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Todd, Richard	Yes
5783	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Holmes, Julie	Yes
5784	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elfin, David	Yes
5785	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zoeter, Mary	Yes
5786	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Phillips, Cheryl	Yes
5787	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thompson, Mary	Yes
5788	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coday, Catherine	Yes
5789	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Turner, Leigh	Yes
5790	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Worden, Wesley	Yes
5791	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Black, Jennifer	Yes
5792	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cleaveland, Beth	Yes
5793	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Roach, J	Yes
5794	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Koman, Jessica	Yes
5795	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Huff-Jerome, Julia	Yes
5796	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Manley, Deborah	Yes
5797	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Klages, Margaret	Yes

0008596

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5798	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Covington, Susan	Yes
5799	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Berry, Colin	Yes
5800	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cardone, Bethany	Yes
5801	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McGlamory, Clay	Yes
5802	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	prager, albra	Yes
5803	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whitaker, Lisa	Yes
5804	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Sarah	Yes
5805	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Davis, Ashley	Yes
5806	5/7/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clarke, Rachel	Yes
5807	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Enes, Kathy	Yes
5808	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shearin, Megan	Yes
5809	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gehrig, Judy	Yes
5810	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ventre, John	Yes
5811	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wood, Judy	Yes
5812	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Khalsa, Cindy	Yes
5813	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	May, Nancy	Yes
5814	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cohen, Howard	Yes
5815	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Phelps, Cyndee	Yes
5816	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	C, Lori	Yes
5817	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sandifer, Char	Yes
5818	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ingram, Sandy	Yes
5819	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brown, M.	Yes
5820	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sawyer, Jesse	Yes
5821	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vagelatos, Eleni	Yes
5822	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Silver, Barbara	Yes
5823	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zedler, Matthew	Yes
5824	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moore, Courtney	Yes
5825	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schor, Mary	Yes
5826	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weglein, Sara	Yes
5827	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sorrells, Robert	Yes
5828	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garry, Mary	Yes
5829	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pannala, Bharat	Yes
5830	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vinson, Rebecca	Yes
5831	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nicholas, Luke	Yes
5832	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sommer, Julia	Yes
5833	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chmyrova, Natalya	Yes
5834	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mapel, Mary	Yes
5835	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Leary, Regan	Yes
5836	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Halliwell, Michelle	Yes
5837	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fedor, Blanche	Yes
5838	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Abernethy, Cynthia	Yes
5839	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weihermuller, Tom	Yes
5840	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sodos, Michael	Yes
5841	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Baranano, Susana	Yes
5842	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Blanchet, Peggy	Yes
5843	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Starosta, Joanna	Yes
5844	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	ulinski, anthony	Yes
5845	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thorn, Teresa	Yes
5846	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leggett, Robert	Yes
5847	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lipe, Amanda	Yes
5848	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fordham, Mal	Yes
5849	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Van Houten, Beverley	Yes
5850	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Donini, Elizabeth	Yes
5851	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Irish, Lura	Yes
5852	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Labby, Daniel	Yes
5853	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Block, Bruce	Yes

0008597

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5854	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	cellucci, mary	Yes
5855	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young-Carrasquillo, Penelope	Yes
5856	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walsh, Jr., Joseph	Yes
5857	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wirsneck, Robert	Yes
5858	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D'Onofrio, Sue	Yes
5859	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kopp, Willaim	Yes
5860	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cappuccio, Sharon	Yes
5861	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Underwood, Todd	Yes
5862	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tufano, Emma	Yes
5863	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coslet, Christine	Yes
5864	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeNavarrete, Susan	Yes
5865	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siegrist, Gary	Yes
5866	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fahr, Marcelle	Yes
5867	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harber, Gregory J	Yes
5868	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wagner, Matthew &quot;Elvis&quot;	Yes
5869	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ausman, Erica	Yes
5870	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sorensen, Mark	Yes
5871	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Erickson, Elaine	Yes
5872	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hueber, Amy	Yes
5873	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Messier, Linda	Yes
5874	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Thomas	Yes
5875	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holder, Ian Alan	Yes
5876	5/7/2010	Master (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elliot, Barbara	Yes
5877	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	schick, virginia	Yes
5878	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ritzman, Donald	Yes
5879	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shapiro, Robert	Yes
5880	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mostov, Elizabeth	Yes
5881	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ellinger, Gina	Yes
5882	5/7/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	Ontario Kite Boarding Association	Benvenuti, Josh	Yes
5883	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Keefe, Michael C	No
5884	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harper, Samuel B	No
5885	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Doswell, Robert	No
5886	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Swiger, Diana	Yes
5887	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mills, Lesia	Yes
5888	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bottner, Sheryl	Yes
5889	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Berger, Nancy	Yes
5890	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hale, Laurie	Yes
5891	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Groft, Pamela	Yes
5892	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harman, Chris	Yes
5893	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McCabe, Nancy	Yes
5894	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hunt, Linda	Yes
5895	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gray, Erin	Yes
5896	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ortt, Jeannette	Yes
5897	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Engle, Eliza	Yes
5898	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Furr, Cameron	Yes
5899	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Maddens, Joe	Yes
5900	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hill, Jennifer	Yes
5901	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, susan	Yes
5902	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jenkins, Colleen	Yes
5903	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Feist, Dayna	Yes
5904	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Covarrubias, Geovana	Yes
5905	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rikard, Denise	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5906	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lynch, Marie	Yes
5907	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ashton, Ann	Yes
5908	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Safrit, Gail	Yes
5909	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hoffman, Robert	Yes
5910	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mattingly, Collette	Yes
5911	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gewiss, Linda	Yes
5912	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Killberg Thoreson, Lynn	Yes
5913	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McPherson, Dawn	Yes
5914	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hill, Sheri	Yes
5915	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mull, Jonathan	Yes
5916	5/7/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ostwalt, Alisa	Yes
5917	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Salomon, Sherry	Yes
5918	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carrick, Mary	Yes
5919	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lorch, Jason	Yes
5920	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Watts, Lindsey	Yes
5921	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brunschwyler, Caroline	Yes
5922	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Arrant, Elaine	Yes
5923	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Leo	Yes
5924	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hyjek, Kate	Yes
5925	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Orner, Karen	Yes
5926	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bridges, Mary	Yes
5927	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cheney, G. William	Yes
5928	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burkett, Phyllis	Yes
5929	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hennessy, Marycarol	Yes
5930	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miller, Jennifer	Yes
5931	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rittenmeyer, Pat	Yes
5932	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McCoy, Howard	Yes
5933	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Oesterle, Dawn	Yes
5934	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Austin, Emily	Yes
5935	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dinkins, Lisa	Yes
5936	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hines, Deborah	Yes
5937	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Nancy	Yes
5938	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nowack, Mary	Yes
5939	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wheeler, Maureen	Yes
5940	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lamdan, Shirley	Yes
5941	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Peitersen, Matthew	Yes
5942	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Janet	Yes
5943	5/7/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Huddleston, Tim	Yes
5944	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carson, Josh	Yes
5945	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fallica, Jonathan	Yes
5946	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Haskins, Mary	Yes
5947	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elliott, Amber	Yes
5948	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Porter, Melanie	Yes
5949	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Singer, DDS, Jeffrey	Yes
5950	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clark, Lorelee	Yes
5951	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Grasso, Dori	Yes
5952	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lacatena, Lisa	Yes
5953	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hogger, Chris	Yes
5954	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brinkman, Mary	Yes
5955	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Benson, Sarah	Yes
5956	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	D'Onofrio, Adam	Yes
5957	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kaufman, Debra	Yes
5958	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Decker, Sarah	Yes
5959	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schwartz, Joan	Yes

0008599

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
5960	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Feurer, Patricia	Yes
5961	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Feury, Patricia	Yes
5962	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leeseberg-Lange, BettyAnn	Yes
5963	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hawkins, Angela J.	Yes
5964	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pelle, Barbara	Yes
5965	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lenhart, Lorena	Yes
5966	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elkins, Wendy	Yes
5967	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mahaney, christine	Yes
5968	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clark, James	Yes
5969	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sorrells, Dennis	Yes
5970	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Epatko, Mary	Yes
5971	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Marx, Jeffrey	Yes
5972	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Guidera, Katie	Yes
5973	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hogan, Maura	Yes
5974	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sedlovsky, Inga	Yes
5975	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Colt, Sandra	Yes
5976	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Roeber, Nancy	Yes
5977	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mills, Tiffany	Yes
5978	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Levin, June	Yes
5979	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rubino, Mata	Yes
5980	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nichols, Patricia	Yes
5981	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shinn, Carolyn	Yes
5982	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schilpp, Gordon	Yes
5983	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mills, Donna	Yes
5984	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Walters, Lee	Yes
5985	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Welton, Thomas	Yes
5986	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sherrard, Kathy	Yes
5987	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gorozdos, Annie	Yes
5988	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	La Rocca, Isabella	Yes
5989	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wedow, Nancy	Yes
5990	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holland, John	Yes
5991	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woywod, Cher	Yes
5992	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Poxon, Judith	Yes
5993	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frederick, Brian	Yes
5994	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilleo, Nancy	Yes
5995	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nemetz, Leah	Yes
5996	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clemo, Katherine	Yes
5997	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shaw, Mary	Yes
5998	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Abalo, Aimee	Yes
5999	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ruth, Robin	Yes
6000	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weller, Dorothy	Yes
6001	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carll, Melissa	Yes
6002	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barrett, Joan	Yes
6003	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dybal, Michelle	Yes
6004	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johns, Patricia	Yes
6005	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klaput, Donna and Bob	Yes
6006	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marott, David	Yes
6007	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Banks, Ph.D., Patrick J.	Yes
6008	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Feury, Patricia	Yes
6009	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Anne	Yes
6010	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brooks, Rhoda	Yes
6011	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mayfield-Chapin, Shannon	Yes
6012	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steele, Dr. Richard	Yes
6013	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mooney, Elizabeth	Yes

0008600

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6014	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Potter, Dave	Yes
6015	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lachat, Judith	Yes
6016	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lipner, Janet	Yes
6017	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hyink, Barbara	Yes
6018	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brandon, Alice	Yes
6019	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saribas, Pauline	Yes
6020	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fineran, Mary	Yes
6021	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cardno, Andrew	Yes
6022	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ousset, Glenn	Yes
6023	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		S, J	No
6024	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McDonagh, Michael P	Yes
6025	5/7/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Harrill, William P	Yes
6026	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwartz, Andy	Yes
6027	5/7/2010	Master (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dunster, Randy C	Yes
6028	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Self	Kniffen, Donald A	Yes
6029	5/7/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	YK Kiteboarding & SUP	Meyer, Matthew	No
6030	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Donovant, Mike	Yes
6031	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Folliard, Patricia	Yes
6032	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gardner, Gigi	Yes
6033	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hubbard, Al	Yes
6034	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mineo, Susan	Yes
6035	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rhodes-Robinson, Skye	Yes
6036	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rogers, Bill	Yes
6037	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	West, Bill	Yes
6038	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hamilton, James	Yes
6039	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nikkel, David	Yes
6040	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Davis, Sarah	Yes
6041	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dail, Jason	Yes
6042	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rol, Anna Natalie	Yes
6043	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Potash, Louis	Yes
6044	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hecker, Laurel	Yes
6045	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Poteat, Janet	Yes
6046	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schenk, B.	Yes
6047	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ashley, Edward	Yes
6048	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coble, Jack	Yes
6049	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Verna, Tara	Yes
6050	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Saxton-Ruiz, Ben	Yes
6051	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Khan, Jo	Yes
6052	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Altsheler, Lindsey	Yes
6053	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sklar, Stephanie	Yes
6054	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Berman, Alysia	Yes
6055	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McCarty, Erin	Yes
6056	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boyer, Alyson	Yes
6057	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	C., Lynne	Yes
6058	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gaeta, Ruth	Yes
6059	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Karandish, Sara	Yes
6060	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Taylor, Tom	Yes
6061	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wedan, Sarah	Yes
6062	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pedigo, Vaudene	Yes
6063	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Frazier, Shelley	Yes
6064	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Finch, Valerie	Yes
6065	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lewis, Sarah	Yes
6066	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Connor, Kathleen	Yes
6067	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Colmus, Ann	Yes
6068	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mitchell, Mary	Yes
6069	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lawrence, Jane	Yes

0008601

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6070	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Webb, Fern	Yes
6071	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Koscielski, Bianca	Yes
6072	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bridgett, Leslie	Yes
6073	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Truly, Amy	Yes
6074	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wood, Mindy	Yes
6075	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bayne, Scott	Yes
6076	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bader, Joanna	Yes
6077	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Raymond	Yes
6078	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Rheta	Yes
6079	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sachs Klein, Allison	Yes
6080	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Svirsky, Janet	Yes
6081	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gupton, William	Yes
6082	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Hara, Brian	Yes
6083	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Adair, Sandra	Yes
6084	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thomas, James	Yes
6085	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hickey, P	Yes
6086	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Noack, Gerri	Yes
6087	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brymer, Patricia	Yes
6088	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Karp, Abbe	Yes
6089	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Walters, Karen	Yes
6090	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nikolic, Catherine	Yes
6091	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Speciale, Samuel	Yes
6092	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sheils, Ruthmary	Yes
6093	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hirsch, Harriet	Yes
6094	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Serene	Yes
6095	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	King, Joey	Yes
6096	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barker, Brittany	Yes
6097	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tierney, Robin	Yes
6098	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fahmy, Natalie	Yes
6099	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Loretta	Yes
6100	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Christman, Sidney	Yes
6101	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cavoly, Dianne	Yes
6102	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rector, George	Yes
6103	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Myers, Robert	Yes
6104	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rominger, Nancy	Yes
6105	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kapeluk, Sharon	Yes
6106	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wray, Jim	Yes
6107	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Van Dijk, Peter	Yes
6108	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Edwards, Denise	Yes
6109	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dunn, John	Yes
6110	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Syne, Sonja	Yes
6111	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vickers, Abigail	Yes
6112	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mantas, Nicholas	Yes
6113	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haeck, Christa	Yes
6114	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Engelman, Marilin	Yes
6115	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carrara, Wayne	Yes
6116	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, David	Yes
6117	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roberts, Pamela	Yes
6118	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McAuley, Joanne	Yes
6119	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Matz, Tamara	Yes
6120	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McMillan, Linda	Yes
6121	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brush, Debbie	Yes
6122	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brooks, Evelyn	Yes
6123	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Vicki	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6124	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dobosh, George	Yes
6125	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morris, Penny	Yes
6126	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Van Schaick, Kathleen	Yes
6127	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cosgrave, Julianne	Yes
6128	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nash, Jonathan	Yes
6129	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schiloni, Cathleen	Yes
6130	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Falk, Connie	Yes
6131	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Merkamp, Gary	Yes
6132	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gillingham, Cathey	Yes
6133	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schlott, Cathy	Yes
6134	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Daab, Antoinette	Yes
6135	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	King, Mary and Richard	Yes
6136	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Douglas, Tammy	Yes
6137	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curtis, Barbara	Yes
6138	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fels, Richard	Yes
6139	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Powers, Suzan Michele	Yes
6140	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Francisco, Linda	Yes
6141	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Does, Mark	Yes
6142	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Anderson, Peter N	No
6143	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weatherhead, Georgia	Yes
6144	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leyser, Barbara	Yes
6145	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	dominick, sherry	Yes
6146	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whelan, Pam	Yes
6147	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bergman, Margot	Yes
6148	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cleveland, Donovan	Yes
6149	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miller, Melissa	Yes
6150	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Crowl, Beverly	Yes
6151	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Herman, Alan	Yes
6152	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sawyer, George	Yes
6153	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Koonce, Rheama	Yes
6154	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Larsen, Eric	Yes
6155	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Upman, Sommer	Yes
6156	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Seay, Jamie	Yes
6157	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thorson, Janice	Yes
6158	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ucko, Aaron	Yes
6159	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kommuck, Valerie	Yes
6160	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Childers, Gary	Yes
6161	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Proctor, Missy	Yes
6162	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chandler, Sharon	Yes
6163	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kasey, C.	Yes
6164	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	White, Phyllis	Yes
6165	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Bob	Yes
6166	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Houston, AE	Yes
6167	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bower-Smith, Nola	Yes
6168	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Seward, Trish	Yes
6169	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cohen, Murry	Yes
6170	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sowder, Barbara	Yes
6171	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rees, Margaret	Yes
6172	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weinischke, Deborah	Yes
6173	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mooney, Nicole	Yes
6174	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thomas, Joan	Yes
6175	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Joyce	Yes
6176	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Taylor, Isabel	Yes
6177	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	White, Steven	Yes
6178	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wouk, Kari	Yes

0008603

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6179	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Quattlebaum, Leslie	Yes
6180	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Beasley, Donna	Yes
6181	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Poliansky, Hope	Yes
6182	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Crittenden, Robin	Yes
6183	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reeves, David	Yes
6184	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miller, Steven	Yes
6185	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rohl, Stephen	Yes
6186	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Eblen, Paul	Yes
6187	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Stacey	Yes
6188	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Kathryn	Yes
6189	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Morgan, Michael	Yes
6190	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thomas, Carol	Yes
6191	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leonard, Valerie	Yes
6192	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thorpe, Jennifer	Yes
6193	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hackforth, Pamela	Yes
6194	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burandt, Kimberly	Yes
6195	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Valiga, Susan	Yes
6196	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	La Joie, Dara	Yes
6197	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wright, Lawrence	Yes
6198	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reiss, Edward	Yes
6199	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cucchiara, Stephen	Yes
6200	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Swift, Kristin	Yes
6201	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Adriance, Gesa	Yes
6202	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McLean, Sue	Yes
6203	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bettis, Leeann	Yes
6204	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Taggart, Deborah	Yes
6205	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Woermann, Konrad	Yes
6206	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gattuso, Karen	Yes
6207	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pacello, Kristin	Yes
6208	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Crain, Christopher	Yes
6209	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McKnight, Samantha	Yes
6210	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brookes, Steve	Yes
6211	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Winston, Leslie	Yes
6212	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bower-Smith, Marin	Yes
6213	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leavitt, Bonita	Yes
6214	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Knaflich, Alyce	Yes
6215	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Joanie	Yes
6216	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	d'Entremont, Denise	Yes
6217	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Koch, Kristin	Yes
6218	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hitt, Carl	Yes
6219	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fleming, Nancy	Yes
6220	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kaplan, Ira	Yes
6221	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Warren, Alicie	Yes
6222	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brawner, Lisa	Yes
6223	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stubbs, Jessica	Yes
6224	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	leek, katherine	Yes
6225	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hagen, Rosemary	Yes
6226	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sachs, Nancy	Yes
6227	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kozie, Karin	Yes
6228	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rosenberg, Nancy	Yes
6229	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pence, Deanna	Yes
6230	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martell, Jon	Yes
6231	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bergman, Richard	Yes
6232	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rings, Sally	Yes

0008604

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6233	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Raven, Amy	Yes
6234	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frey, David	Yes
6235	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saja, Jean	Yes
6236	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reams, Gail J.	Yes
6237	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gardner, ReNae	Yes
6238	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fiebelkorn, Sandy	Yes
6239	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sullivan, Rob	Yes
6240	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sholtz, Laura	Yes
6241	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ashton, Susan	Yes
6242	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rocks, Brent	Yes
6243	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Insana, Frank	Yes
6244	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Press, Ansula	Yes
6245	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	David, Marcia and Wolfgang	Yes
6246	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Matwichuk, Gail	Yes
6247	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Singh, Bhanu	Yes
6248	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanchez, Heather	Yes
6249	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lynn, Candice	Yes
6250	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Powley, Carol	Yes
6251	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Daniels, Stacey	Yes
6252	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hjort, Richard	Yes
6253	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taylor, JoAnne	Yes
6254	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	List, Gerhardt	Yes
6255	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caldwell, Mariel	Yes
6256	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bowers Schwan, Bettina	Yes
6257	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pasztor, gregory	Yes
6258	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sheridan, Gabriel	Yes
6259	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jakusz, Heather	Yes
6260	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carter, Gary	Yes
6261	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Michael	Yes
6262	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	higgs, bradford	Yes
6263	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simon, Alexandra	Yes
6264	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fetz, Margot	Yes
6265	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Friel, Amelia	Yes
6266	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Papandrea, John	Yes
6267	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Negri, Pamela	Yes
6268	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	neal, cynthia	Yes
6269	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vidar, Linda	Yes
6270	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donovan, Brian	Yes
6271	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brukner, Barbara	Yes
6272	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Picard, John	Yes
6273	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rowald, Chris	Yes
6274	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sharkey, Mary	Yes
6275	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wachter, Andrea	Yes
6276	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Linarez, Karen	Yes
6277	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drury, Patricia	Yes
6278	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Imperiale, Yvonne	Yes
6279	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hubert III, Philip A	Yes
6280	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donovan, Stephan	Yes
6281	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Jeremy	Yes
6282	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pister, Phil	Yes
6283	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adams, Jan	Yes
6284	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	buckley, spike	Yes
6285	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dennis, Michele	Yes
6286	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Visperas, Carlene	Yes
6287	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Mark	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6288	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meyer, Leonard	Yes
6289	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alseth, Bobbi	Yes
6290	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dalia, Wendy	Yes
6291	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zuckerman, Laurie	Yes
6292	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Muraski, Anne	Yes
6293	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dzubak, Cheri	Yes
6294	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miles, Vic	Yes
6295	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Straub, Carolyn	Yes
6296	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Conklin, Lyn	Yes
6297	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chwastiak, Michele	Yes
6298	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sefton, John	Yes
6299	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Good, Deirdre	Yes
6300	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Welch, Joanna F.	Yes
6301	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meldahl, Deborah	Yes
6302	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Evilsizer, Susan	Yes
6303	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tompkins, Suzi	Yes
6304	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garman, Brenda	Yes
6305	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cyger, Ron	Yes
6306	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ross, Deren	Yes
6307	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mira, Ginger	Yes
6308	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dwyer, Jim	Yes
6309	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Denneen, Bill	Yes
6310	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Centner, Randy	Yes
6311	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Banks, Diane	Yes
6312	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clemont, Audrey	Yes
6313	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lee, Benson	Yes
6314	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Merz, Terri	Yes
6315	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCool, Melissa	Yes
6316	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nissenbaum, Alan	Yes
6317	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drost, Leilani	Yes
6318	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bird, Kenneth	Yes
6319	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jasper, Marilyn	Yes
6320	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Horton, Linda	Yes
6321	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rust, Thomas	Yes
6322	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sinacore, Paul	Yes
6323	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kuelper, Carol	Yes
6324	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kashiv, Yoav	Yes
6325	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Futterer, Joe	Yes
6326	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Claytor, Lynda	Yes
6327	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Daniels-mcqueen, Susan	Yes
6328	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garretson Friedman, Susan	Yes
6329	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kaufman, Andrea	Yes
6330	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yang, Rose	Yes
6331	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sinopoli, Teri	Yes
6332	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jaime, Tina	Yes
6333	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ostrosky, Richard	Yes
6334	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Krebs, Susan	Yes
6335	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mellon, Mary Lou	Yes
6336	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tripp, Wendy	Yes
6337	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	forner, Patricia	Yes
6338	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mattias, Joseph	Yes
6339	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Guise, Elizabeth	Yes
6340	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graham, Linda	Yes
6341	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	kay-hazou, natasha	Yes
6342	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Jim	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6343	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Travis, Annabelle	Yes
6344	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pace, Marissa	Yes
6345	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caplan-Bennett, Paul	Yes
6346	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schwartz, Jack	Yes
6347	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chavez, Lela	Yes
6348	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kester, Doris	Yes
6349	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	keyishian, sarah	Yes
6350	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ginalski, Geneva	Yes
6351	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Groom, Kim	Yes
6352	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oldershaw, Susan	Yes
6353	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bolemon, Joanne	Yes
6354	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gonsalves, John	Yes
6355	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seymour, Joan	Yes
6356	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jaroslaw, Ilene	Yes
6357	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lieberman, Myrna	Yes
6358	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gluth, Karin	Yes
6359	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vega, Elinor	Yes
6360	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lopez, Joyce P.	Yes
6361	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilbert, Camille	Yes
6362	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brewer, Richard	Yes
6363	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Doyle, Laurance	Yes
6364	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sawhney, Pat	Yes
6365	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roberts, Ed	Yes
6366	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Angelson, Judith	Yes
6367	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fisher, Jon	Yes
6368	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Amato, julie	Yes
6369	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Powell, Victoria	Yes
6370	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Foodim, Stanley	Yes
6371	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nordenberg, Janice	Yes
6372	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	liu, sandy	Yes
6373	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Friedman, Glenn	Yes
6374	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeMichele, Natalee	Yes
6375	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burke, Ken	Yes
6376	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jackson, Susan	Yes
6377	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	keeler, melisa	Yes
6378	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pedersen, Barbara	Yes
6379	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klinke, David	Yes
6380	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maurer, Keith and Sandra	Yes
6381	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Russell, Dorothy	Yes
6382	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hart, Karla	Yes
6383	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hunter, Jeffrey	Yes
6384	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rutledge, Leon	Yes
6385	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Huff, Burney	Yes
6386	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woodside, Lisa	Yes
6387	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dennis, Tessa	Yes
6388	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scholz, Ernest	Yes
6389	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Townsager, Mary	Yes
6390	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	OBrien, Darrin	Yes
6391	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thatcher, Sherry	Yes
6392	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gagliardotto Garry, Lorraine	Yes
6393	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morey, Kathy	Yes
6394	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walters, Sheryl	Yes
6395	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brestin, Miriam	Yes
6396	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lieber, kurt	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6397	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kroth, Denise	Yes
6398	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blackstone, Ellen	Yes
6399	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nishizaki, Lela	Yes
6400	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeAngelis, T	Yes
6401	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Birren, Lori	Yes
6402	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barbezat, Mary	Yes
6403	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ferrin, Sheryl	Yes
6404	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Manning, Susan	Yes
6405	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eppig, Laura M.	Yes
6406	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	gallo, john	Yes
6407	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Whitehead, Justine	Yes
6408	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myers, Carol	Yes
6409	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carlson, Rita	Yes
6410	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Markovic, Frances	Yes
6411	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	West, Julie	Yes
6412	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Armer, Joan/Paul	Yes
6413	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brucker, Marianne	Yes
6414	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Friedt-Gyulay, Donna	Yes
6415	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wanat, John	Yes
6416	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sears, Carol	Yes
6417	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hansen, Christine	Yes
6418	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Linney	Yes
6419	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schiedt, Mary	Yes
6420	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fisher, Owen	Yes
6421	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Lara	Yes
6422	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cremer, Mike	Yes
6423	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Day, Joanne	Yes
6424	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cosgrove, John	Yes
6425	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilliland, Ken	Yes
6426	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilbert, Julie	Yes
6427	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wights, Reanna	Yes
6428	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pisetsky, Roy	Yes
6429	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lazard, Naomi	Yes
6430	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cohen, Isabel and Carl	Yes
6431	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Langford, Nell	Yes
6432	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ramon, Alberto	Yes
6433	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lambert, Gwen	Yes
6434	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morrison, Elizabeth	Yes
6435	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hartwick, A.	Yes
6436	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allebach, Candy	Yes
6437	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	GENTZ, CAROL	Yes
6438	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bouvier, H. Karl	Yes
6439	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brinton, Valerie	Yes
6440	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Teller, Ian	Yes
6441	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hand, ellen	Yes
6442	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jasper, Jessica	Yes
6443	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, David	Yes
6444	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anglin, JoAnn	Yes
6445	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Motta, Michael	Yes
6446	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	holder, ursula	Yes
6447	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sheets, Gabriel	Yes
6448	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gillis, Kay	Yes
6449	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howard, G. A.	Yes
6450	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gley, Debra	Yes
6451	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gohlke, Linda	Yes
6452	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sonner, Paul	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6453	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goffe, Beth	Yes
6454	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sears, Margaret	Yes
6455	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kegley, Charles	Yes
6456	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barnsback, Richard	Yes
6457	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gutkowski, Marie	Yes
6458	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCrone, Lucy	Yes
6459	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Okimoto, Shelley	Yes
6460	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DiStaso, Crystal	Yes
6461	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fleming, Dawn	Yes
6462	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tim, Nancy	Yes
6463	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Orr, Barbara	Yes
6464	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bernstein, Scott	Yes
6465	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bernard, Janice	Yes
6466	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	myers, bob	Yes
6467	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tanoury, Mary	Yes
6468	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siminski, Julian	Yes
6469	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Marcia	Yes
6470	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bondoc, Jose Ricardo	Yes
6471	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolcott Mendelson, Valorie	Yes
6472	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Turkewitz, Aaron	Yes
6473	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sheehey, Alison	Yes
6474	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kleinberg, Jeremy	Yes
6475	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swanson, Brian	Yes
6476	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simon, Joan	Yes
6477	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Capobianco, Anthony	Yes
6478	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Watts-Rosenfeld, Susan	Yes
6479	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Geiser, John	Yes
6480	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weeks, Marion	Yes
6481	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donnafield, Kathleen	Yes
6482	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Robert	Yes
6483	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dibell, Beverly	Yes
6484	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Feddeler, Bill and Marilyn	Yes
6485	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mapes, Alan	Yes
6486	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Godbee, Allycia	Yes
6487	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mehrotra, Siddharth	Yes
6488	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MacKrell, Chris	Yes
6489	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marino, Lynne	Yes
6490	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Geier, Eric	Yes
6491	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alexander, Mary	Yes
6492	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hossan, Carole	Yes
6493	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kunke, Pamela	Yes
6494	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baldock, Teresa	Yes
6495	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Setterlin, Susan	Yes
6496	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sneiderwine, William	Yes
6497	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mendoza, Nancy	Yes
6498	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dramer, Peter	Yes
6499	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graham, Tom	Yes
6500	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	August, Jane	Yes
6501	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Strobel, Jeanine	Yes
6502	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fairbarn, Carissa	Yes
6503	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Broussard, David	Yes
6504	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barnette, Jane	Yes
6505	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Julie	Yes
6506	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frenkel, Steven	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6507	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	warner, tom	Yes
6508	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	easton, carol	Yes
6509	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Monroe, Dean	Yes
6510	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Judith	Yes
6511	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lowe, Patsy	Yes
6512	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oliver, Reed	Yes
6513	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Felton, Penny	Yes
6514	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Andrews, Jean	Yes
6515	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Armer, Kendra	Yes
6516	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beck, Margaret	Yes
6517	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edmonston, Pandora	Yes
6518	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cooper, Katherine	Yes
6519	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maher, Kathleen	Yes
6520	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ocana, Melissa	Yes
6521	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schomaker, Carlos	Yes
6522	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Radford, Nancy	Yes
6523	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Toigo, Joe	Yes
6524	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	menkes, barbara	Yes
6525	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oliver, Phyllis	Yes
6526	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tucker, Barbara	Yes
6527	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Krauss, Hans	Yes
6528	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frey-Brown, Sherry	Yes
6529	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	depietro, robin	Yes
6530	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	schumann, char	Yes
6531	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leong, Robin	Yes
6532	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Jeanie	Yes
6533	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meier, Matthew	Yes
6534	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Donald	Yes
6535	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pearce, Judith	Yes
6536	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hubacek, Richard	Yes
6537	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Malmid, Wendy	Yes
6538	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blaire, Jan	Yes
6539	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Will, John F.	Yes
6540	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	marchand, bobbi	Yes
6541	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	James, Barb	Yes
6542	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cleveland, Kelly	Yes
6543	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Denny, Rachael	Yes
6544	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cypherd, Victoria	Yes
6545	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boud, Patricia	Yes
6546	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dolloff, Jacoba	Yes
6547	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNamara, Lynne	Yes
6548	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Atkinson, Gwen	Yes
6549	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ende, Elizabeth	Yes
6550	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D'Antonio, Lisa	Yes
6551	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Clifford	Yes
6552	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blain, Richard	Yes
6553	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Remick, Judith	Yes
6554	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pavloff, Laura	Yes
6555	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DuVall, Julie	Yes
6556	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoogs, Faith	Yes
6557	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beatty, Lorne	Yes
6558	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bishop, Carmen	Yes
6559	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Krantz, Stefanie	Yes
6560	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Petersen, Rodney	Yes
6561	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swick, Nathan	Yes
6562	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hasselbald, Kristin	Yes

0008610

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6563	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sarovec, William E.	Yes
6564	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carter, Meg	Yes
6565	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gerszberg, Sherry	Yes
6566	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sabin, Heather	Yes
6567	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burger, Michael	Yes
6568	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carey, Kristina	Yes
6569	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Applebaum, Doris	Yes
6570	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dutton, Lisa	Yes
6571	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cardoni, John	Yes
6572	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brigham, Rick	Yes
6573	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harrison, Norma J F	Yes
6574	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bachmann, Sonya	Yes
6575	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mastropaolo-Bocle, Maria	Yes
6576	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sapia-Bosch, Gloria E.	Yes
6577	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoaglin, Donna	Yes
6578	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGill, Ann C.	Yes
6579	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crist, Ed	Yes
6580	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hutchinson, Kelly	Yes
6581	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rudin, Linda	Yes
6582	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vespa, Kim	Yes
6583	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weber, Bonnie	Yes
6584	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schoppe, Bruce	Yes
6585	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greenwood, Fred	Yes
6586	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tei, kathleen	Yes
6587	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nowicki, Ann	Yes
6588	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Balzan, Darlene	Yes
6589	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gruber QEP(Qualified Environmental Professional), Lee	Yes
6590	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacobson, Robert	Yes
6591	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murphy, Diane	Yes
6592	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bright, Leon	Yes
6593	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gentry, Rita	Yes
6594	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nowak, Mary Lou	Yes
6595	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lambeth, Ron	Yes
6596	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	r, Joyce	Yes
6597	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mason, Marcie	Yes
6598	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Payne, Cristina	Yes
6599	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boole, Kathryn	Yes
6600	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cox, Ian	Yes
6601	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lochner, Jan	Yes
6602	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SPIELER, DAVE	Yes
6603	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fogel, Captain Joel S.	Yes
6604	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Horgan, Patrick	Yes
6605	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Battaly, Gertrude	Yes
6606	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lawrence, carol	Yes
6607	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Friessen, Michelle	Yes
6608	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Huelsberg, Carole	Yes
6609	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Khalsa, Mha Atma S	Yes
6610	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Byrd, Beth	Yes
6611	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Erickson, Stephanie	Yes
6612	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilcken, Lois	Yes
6613	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	conrad, suzanne	Yes
6614	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edwards, Eric	Yes
6615	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curry, Donna	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6616	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	YOUNG, C. B.	Yes
6617	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thomae, Laura	Yes
6618	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reiss, Cadi	Yes
6619	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ashelman, D.R.	Yes
6620	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beldyga, Hannah	Yes
6621	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saveri, Elizabeth	Yes
6622	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gray, William	Yes
6623	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holtz, Sue	Yes
6624	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDonald, Mara	Yes
6625	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Judy	Yes
6626	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	beckman, mary	Yes
6627	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Willems, Sander	Yes
6628	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kimbrell, Barbara	Yes
6629	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Curtis, James	Yes
6630	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	James, Gordon	Yes
6631	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chatsworth, J.	Yes
6632	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Werth, Delia	Yes
6633	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	brinkman, john	Yes
6634	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Connell, Debra	Yes
6635	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Silan, Sheila	Yes
6636	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Soeder, Lyn	Yes
6637	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	melikian, sira	Yes
6638	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leavell, Chuck	Yes
6639	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Perello, Dominic	Yes
6640	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dittmyer, Jean	Yes
6641	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scranton, Ms.Elizabeth	Yes
6642	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hairgrove, Kelly	Yes
6643	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Healy, Patricia	Yes
6644	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeAngelis, Rita	Yes
6645	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hungerford, Susan	Yes
6646	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mattson, Virginia	Yes
6647	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Janssen, Jennifer	Yes
6648	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Redish, Maryellen	Yes
6649	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacques, Laus	Yes
6650	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Evans, Rebecca	Yes
6651	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Esser, Nicholas	Yes
6652	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Christensen, Erica	Yes
6653	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	maida-young, jenny	Yes
6654	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barker, Anne	Yes
6655	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mayo, Kathleen	Yes
6656	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ayala, Arthur	Yes
6657	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coger, W Joyce	Yes
6658	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Geary, Kimberley	Yes
6659	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richards, Vivien	Yes
6660	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vosler, Anne	Yes
6661	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Angell, Gilia	Yes
6662	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bowers, Sampson	Yes
6663	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yount, Jo	Yes
6664	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Guthrie, Todd	Yes
6665	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young, Lowell	Yes
6666	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	carteno, roberto	Yes
6667	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pence, Tracey	Yes
6668	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elkins, Peter	Yes
6669	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MacMillan, Gail	Yes
6670	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Royer, Allen	Yes
6671	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fitzgerald, Alice	Yes

0008612

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6672	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Noah, Sandra	Yes
6673	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	peterson, april	Yes
6674	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crawford, Gayle D.	Yes
6675	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shelton, Janet	Yes
6676	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mizuguchi, Naoko	Yes
6677	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Giannini, Christine	Yes
6678	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Langham, Jeri	Yes
6679	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mendes, Ruth	Yes
6680	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aronson, Marsha	Yes
6681	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clark, Martina	Yes
6682	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanning, Dorothy	Yes
6683	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	HLAT, MIKE	Yes
6684	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peterson, Roy	Yes
6685	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allen, Paul	Yes
6686	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	heitz, marcia	Yes
6687	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burrows, Janet	Yes
6688	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coolbaugh, Shauna	Yes
6689	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	H., Littlewolf	Yes
6690	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bernhard, Janet	Yes
6691	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tyrrell, Anne	Yes
6692	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Todd, Michael	Yes
6693	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	beu, lorraine	Yes
6694	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Jan	Yes
6695	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blaisdell, Larry	Yes
6696	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dixon, Vicki	Yes
6697	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hobbs, Jeanette	Yes
6698	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peffer, Kimberly	Yes
6699	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richman, Rebecca	Yes
6700	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thomas, Stacey	Yes
6701	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burke, William	Yes
6702	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klein, Patti	Yes
6703	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vitale, Barbara	Yes
6704	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pine, Joslyn	Yes
6705	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gardiner, Trish	Yes
6706	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pette, Jane	Yes
6707	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nolan, Lee Ann	Yes
6708	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Franzen, Sandra	Yes
6709	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sirtak, Dawn E.	Yes
6710	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Jim	Yes
6711	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chesire, Christine	Yes
6712	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moskovitz, Sandra	Yes
6713	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rich, Marg	Yes
6714	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scott, Michelle	Yes
6715	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garland, Jill	Yes
6716	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Massar, Nancy Ambers	Yes
6717	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Palermo, Patricia	Yes
6718	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roschke, Micah	Yes
6719	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Freson, Neil	Yes
6720	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MCDONOUGH, Pamela	Yes
6721	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vedejs, Christi	Yes
6722	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, Nevin	Yes
6723	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Saenger, Peter	Yes
6724	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schrank, Nicole	Yes
6725	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Briner, Mary Lou	Yes
6726	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hetrick, Nathan	Yes

0008613

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6727	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lemoine, Kathryn Kostelka	Yes
6728	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spevak, Edward	Yes
6729	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kovacs, Wunnesstou	Yes
6730	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Haywood, Fran	Yes
6731	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eshbaugh, Barbara	Yes
6732	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dryden, Tracey	Yes
6733	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rhoades, Don	Yes
6734	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Culbert, Patrick	Yes
6735	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCarty, Jan	Yes
6736	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cox, Brian	Yes
6737	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brundage, Joyce	Yes
6738	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moitoret, Cathryn	Yes
6739	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wagner, Sandra	Yes
6740	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kogut, Greg	Yes
6741	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Slotnick, Lauryn	Yes
6742	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Watkoski, Joe	Yes
6743	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gould, Laura	Yes
6744	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Sandie	Yes
6745	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klemic, Priscilla	Yes
6746	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Riesmeyer, William	Yes
6747	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dulgeroff, Mary	Yes
6748	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moller, Jay	Yes
6749	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pelletier, Marie	Yes
6750	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDonald, Holly	Yes
6751	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Donnell, DeDe	Yes
6752	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Liszeo, Barbara	Yes
6753	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Desmond, Pamela	Yes
6754	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Franklin, Audrey	Yes
6755	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myers, Adele	Yes
6756	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Marcia	Yes
6757	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kennedy, Elizabeth	Yes
6758	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tyx, Irina	Yes
6759	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Elkins, Cheryl	Yes
6760	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chichester, Barbara	Yes
6761	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edgren, Mark	Yes
6762	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dykema, Cornelius	Yes
6763	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gillespie, Kelly	Yes
6764	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Iuppi, maxa	Yes
6765	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lamb, Laina	Yes
6766	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barankovich, Amy	Yes
6767	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lohmann, Lars	Yes
6768	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shreve, Rick	Yes
6769	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SMITH, DEBORAH	Yes
6770	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNew, Sandra	Yes
6771	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rutherford, Charlotte	Yes
6772	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stearns, Gerry	Yes
6773	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dayton, RuthAnne	Yes
6774	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hinkle, Christina	Yes
6775	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Michael R	Yes
6776	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Herring, Jakota	Yes
6777	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wetmore, Rochelle	Yes
6778	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Orsetti, Nancy	Yes
6779	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elling, Stanage	Yes
6780	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garrou, Julie	Yes
6781	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ozbenian, Serda	Yes

0008614

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6782	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Messina, Steve	Yes
6783	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lovejoy, Susan	Yes
6784	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Alison, Lacy	Yes
6785	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harding, Debra	Yes
6786	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Faircloth, Tiffany	Yes
6787	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hatchion, Sangye	Yes
6788	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Church, Jennifer	Yes
6789	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cox, Michael	Yes
6790	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Snelling, Paul	Yes
6791	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mullins, C.C.	Yes
6792	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fish, Tricia	Yes
6793	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kane, David	Yes
6794	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Spake, Deanna	Yes
6795	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Witherspoon, Ann	Yes
6796	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fitzpatrick, Cynthia	Yes
6797	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schneider, Laura T.	Yes
6798	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brezina, Ivy	Yes
6799	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Lisa	Yes
6800	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ames, Harold	Yes
6801	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Galante, Elizabeth	Yes
6802	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Price, Jane	Yes
6803	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sober, Nina	Yes
6804	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Roberta	Yes
6805	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	VanDruff, Joy	Yes
6806	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stanich, J	Yes
6807	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Janen, Wayne	Yes
6808	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wood, Maria	Yes
6809	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bloom, Slava	Yes
6810	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Snow, Jennifer	Yes
6811	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rowley, Gregory	Yes
6812	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Inferrera, Elizabeth	Yes
6813	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wensien, Kyle	Yes
6814	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hollwedel, Zach	Yes
6815	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mucci, Diane	Yes
6816	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dearbeck, April	Yes
6817	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Owens, Maureen	Yes
6818	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shore, M	Yes
6819	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lamm, Belinda	Yes
6820	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Holman, Heather	Yes
6821	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Williams, Dianne	Yes
6822	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Huntley, Kendall	Yes
6823	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Victoria	Yes
6824	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rosato, Julie	Yes
6825	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Turner, Phyllis	Yes
6826	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thomas, Marc	Yes
6827	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hitchcock, Ralph	Yes
6828	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dai, Vanessa	Yes
6829	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cloud, Michael	Yes
6830	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stowe, Jennifer	Yes
6831	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Beam, Gabriel	Yes
6832	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Goode, Sharon	Yes
6833	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Abernathy, Mary	Yes
6834	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Sharon	Yes

0008615

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6835	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Palmer, R. Brent	Yes
6836	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Andrews, C.	Yes
6837	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gruber, Karen	Yes
6838	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	England, Laura	Yes
6839	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Warren, Kay	Yes
6840	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Damjan	Yes
6841	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Furlong, Lisa	Yes
6842	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harris, Laurel	Yes
6843	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bryant, Elliot	Yes
6844	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wutke, Tara	Yes
6845	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hazelton, George	Yes
6846	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jones, Pam	Yes
6847	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kern, Janet	Yes
6848	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Parker, Susannah	Yes
6849	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Petier, Brian	Yes
6850	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jennings, Ginger	Yes
6851	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Graves, Mary	Yes
6852	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gholz, Barbara	Yes
6853	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bollweg, Teri	Yes
6854	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murphy, Virginia	Yes
6855	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Austin, Marion	Yes
6856	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Randall, Jeff	Yes
6857	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDonald, Kathy	Yes
6858	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Paisley, Janet	Yes
6859	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Porter, Cynthia	Yes
6860	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baldwin, Valerie	Yes
6861	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dulgeroff, Mary	Yes
6862	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nisenholz, Bernard	Yes
6863	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clipper, Katie	Yes
6864	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baker, Norman	Yes
6865	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Colon, Jeff	Yes
6866	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Franz, Sandra	Yes
6867	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kucerak, Michelle	Yes
6868	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brister, Marna	Yes
6869	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rothrock, Rhonda	Yes
6870	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bremer, John	Yes
6871	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roller, Aaron	Yes
6872	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hochendoner, Bernard	Yes
6873	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zimmer, Patricia	Yes
6874	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bryant, Marsha	Yes
6875	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morgan, Gwen	Yes
6876	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	RAEHL, MARY	Yes
6877	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Black, Patricia	Yes
6878	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young, N.	Yes
6879	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reid, Katie	Yes
6880	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Klucsor, Carmen	Yes
6881	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	HOYT, EILEEN	Yes
6882	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Grotewohl, Dan	Yes
6883	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mulligan, Bonnie	Yes
6884	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coats, Tressy	Yes
6885	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lee, Ssh	Yes
6886	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bosch, Henry	Yes
6887	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pais, Manuel	Yes
6888	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Steck, William	Yes
6889	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mora, Michael	Yes

0008616

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6890	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Layton, Michael	Yes
6891	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bell, Tyler	Yes
6892	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Indebetouw, Guy	Yes
6893	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Darling, Richard	Yes
6894	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Jacqueline	Yes
6895	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Alexander, Mary	Yes
6896	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sartwell, Christine	Yes
6897	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gilson, Stephanie	Yes
6898	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rogers, Gail	Yes
6899	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Olmstead-Dean, Stephanie	Yes
6900	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Austin, Gregory	Yes
6901	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Connor, M. Lesley	Yes
6902	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jorgenson, Rhodie	Yes
6903	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Donnell, C	Yes
6904	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mastropole, Kristen	Yes
6905	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McDermott, Mark	Yes
6906	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stoddard, David	Yes
6907	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Collins, Angie	Yes
6908	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brigish, Dina	Yes
6909	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Holt, Janet	Yes
6910	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Meyer, Stan	Yes
6911	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Epperly, Leon	Yes
6912	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jones, Jesse	Yes
6913	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whiteside, Kimberly	Yes
6914	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dumain, Lisa	Yes
6915	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Taylor, James	Yes
6916	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	White, Charlene	Yes
6917	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hallein, Katrina	Yes
6918	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Snelling, Missy	Yes
6919	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Robinson, Cheryl	Yes
6920	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Yorty, Helen	Yes
6921	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sehannie, Paoula	Yes
6922	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stanley, Judith	Yes
6923	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Koch, Aaron	Yes
6924	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fozard, Marcelle	Yes
6925	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Werner, Chris	Yes
6926	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bell, Natalie	Yes
6927	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Purcell, Caroline	Yes
6928	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brophy, Tracy	Yes
6929	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kuny, Megaera	Yes
6930	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Simmons, Amber	Yes
6931	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	drew, lyndsay	Yes
6932	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Brianne	Yes
6933	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ruocco Allen, Patti	Yes
6934	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	L. O'Connor, Ellen	Yes
6935	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Poland, Harise	Yes
6936	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lofgren, Christine	Yes
6937	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Collins, Peggy S.	Yes
6938	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Serafin, Ania	Yes
6939	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Feldman, Mark	Yes
6940	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simmons, Roberta	Yes
6941	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Adele	Yes
6942	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mastropole, Kristen	Yes

0008617

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6943	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lourie, Ann	Yes
6944	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Warren, Jennis	Yes
6945	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Le Cam, Louise	Yes
6946	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Skrobiza, Kim	Yes
6947	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jongsma, Jonathon	Yes
6948	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carbone, Pasquale	Yes
6949	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fleming, Barb	Yes
6950	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Dennis	Yes
6951	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shively, Daniel	Yes
6952	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richardson, Gail and John	Yes
6953	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Groome, Malcolm	Yes
6954	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walberg, Jeriene	Yes
6955	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loper, T	Yes
6956	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stratmann, Johannes	Yes
6957	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Ken	Yes
6958	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oehler, Martha	Yes
6959	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fursich, Robert	Yes
6960	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Corre, Ronnel	Yes
6961	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ryan, Kevin	Yes
6962	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swan, John	Yes
6963	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meissner, Gregory	Yes
6964	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pierson, John H	Yes
6965	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gless, Wayne	No
6966	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Powell, Robin	No
6967	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Camp, Patricia	No
6968	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Camp, Patricia	No
6969	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Giannatti, Nancy	No
6970	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Griffin, Merrill and Larry T	No
6971	4/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Griffin, Merrill and Larry T	No
6972	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DiTondo, Mike	No
6973	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sheffield, Jim	No
6974	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moseley, Brian E	Yes
6975	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bough, Joe	No
6976	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sharp, Bob and Becky	No
6977	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual	DMS	Granger, Dave J	No
6978	4/20/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wright Jr., Robert L	No
6979	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smithson, Dale	No
6980	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elliott, Gabrielle	Yes
6981	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Williamson, Sarah	Yes
6982	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cohen, Jordan	Yes
6983	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harper, Julie	Yes
6984	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Razor, Margaret	Yes
6985	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lombardo, Constance	Yes
6986	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wade, Chris	Yes
6987	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kupferschmid, B.	Yes
6988	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McColl, Suzanne	Yes
6989	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Paulus, Brian	Yes
6990	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Ray	Yes
6991	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Maddalena, Cinzia	Yes
6992	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Mariana	Yes
6993	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Simpson, Rusty	Yes
6994	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Buhrman, LuEllen	Yes

0008618

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
6995	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Skloven, Lydia	Yes
6996	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Aimee	Yes
6997	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thibaut, Charles	Yes
6998	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wedwards, James	Yes
6999	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sterling, Keir	Yes
7000	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Youssef, Dolly	Yes
7001	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	nance, lisa	Yes
7002	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Freeze, John	Yes
7003	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stanberry, Beth	Yes
7004	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hamboyan Harrison, Tatiana	Yes
7005	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elkind, Elizabeth	Yes
7006	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lang, Kristin	Yes
7007	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McGlamery, Trina	Yes
7008	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McCallum, Denise	Yes
7009	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scher, Arnold	Yes
7010	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friedrick, Deborah	Yes
7011	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Elizabeth	Yes
7012	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weir, Mary	Yes
7013	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shine, Maryellen	Yes
7014	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mitchell, Roy	Yes
7015	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	ward, lindsay	Yes
7016	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	March, Sherry	Yes
7017	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Braswell, Neal	Yes
7018	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Simmons, Leslie	Yes
7019	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Graham, Daniel	Yes
7020	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Powell, Edwin	Yes
7021	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fitch, Nancy	Yes
7022	4/22/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Markham, Elaine W	No
7023	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Curreri, Eileen	Yes
7024	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mueller, Joan	Yes
7025	4/21/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwester, E J	No
7026	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gutierrez, Nichole	Yes
7027	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mclaughlin, Bernadette	Yes
7028	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peters, Lisa	Yes
7029	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Huckabee, John	Yes
7030	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Devos, Heidi	Yes
7031	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Horne, Cecilia	Yes
7032	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myklebust, Leif	Yes
7033	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	WOLLSCHLAGER, ANN	Yes
7034	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simone, Beverly	Yes
7035	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hruby, Mary	Yes
7036	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Pitt, Alan	Yes
7037	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fisher, Christina	Yes
7038	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coolbaugh, Joshua	Yes
7039	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Konger, Greg	Yes
7040	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bower, Julian	Yes
7041	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shpillar, Natasha	Yes
7042	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dryfoos, Robert	Yes
7043	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	M., Zorro	Yes
7044	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marsolini, Paul	Yes
7045	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lessels, Linda	Yes
7046	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hearon, Sarah	Yes
7047	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Forest, Agatha	Yes
7048	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weaver, Jane	Yes
7049	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morales, Rosy	Yes

0008619

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7050	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kruszewski, Jackie	Yes
7051	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greenholdt, Kathleen	Yes
7052	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mooney, Elizabeth	Yes
7053	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moderacki, Deidre	Yes
7054	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnston, Celeste	Yes
7055	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Penfold, Hill	Yes
7056	4/23/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwester, E J	No
7057	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Halstein, Francis	No
7058	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Suttles, Kelly M	Yes
7059	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		McNair, Lynn	No
7060	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thompson, Jasen	No
7061	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harvard, Janice C	Yes
7062	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Piku, Steve	Yes
7063	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lydic, Jill	Yes
7064	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boone, Amanda	Yes
7065	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Merris, Sue	Yes
7066	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Maxwell, Wendy	Yes
7067	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bailey, Marcia	Yes
7068	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Falknor, Catherine	Yes
7069	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chevalier, Mary-Lew	Yes
7070	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Murray, Bobbie	Yes
7071	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shoaf, Michael	Yes
7072	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Walker, Robin	Yes
7073	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ribakove, Baiba	Yes
7074	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elias, Mia	Yes
7075	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dulberg, Joan	Yes
7076	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	von Grunebaum, Claudia	Yes
7077	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brett, Dewey	Yes
7078	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fulmer-Scales, Karen	Yes
7079	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wilson, Thomas	Yes
7080	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Martinez, Michaellyn	Yes
7081	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tostanoski, DeeDee	Yes
7082	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Allison, Kelly	Yes
7083	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	MEEK, Laura	Yes
7084	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Salerno, Lori	Yes
7085	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Berger, Trent	Yes
7086	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Soulier, Ruth	Yes
7087	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bourexis, Patricia	Yes
7088	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Toledo, Alea F	Yes
7089	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lucas, Lisa	Yes
7090	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bayes, Ronald	Yes
7091	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kiselewich, Kathleen	Yes
7092	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	wijdoogen, rwijdoogen	Yes
7093	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kazaras, Justin	Yes
7094	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lefler, Terri	Yes
7095	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Crosby, Kathy	Yes
7096	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Haddock, Sara	Yes
7097	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7098	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Besold, Barbara	Yes
7099	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	King, Sarah	Yes
7100	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Khristoforov, Mylee	Yes
7101	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rovere, Dolores	Yes
7102	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dixon, Beverly	Yes
7103	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carr, Melissa	Yes
7104	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rutledge, Brian	Yes
7105	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Asbury, Luke	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7106	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McLean, Rhona	Yes
7107	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marine, Deborah	Yes
7108	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Champion, Margaret	Yes
7109	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henry, Donna	Yes
7110	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	spiro, robert	Yes
7111	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wojnaroski, Sabrina	Yes
7112	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dillmann, George	Yes
7113	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Trapp & Jo Ellen Ryan, Gene R.	Yes
7114	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dionne, Denis	Yes
7115	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moline, Janet	Yes
7116	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barber, Terry	Yes
7117	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bumgardner, Terri	Yes
7118	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rasera, Susan	Yes
7119	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boyd, Christopher	Yes
7120	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Erin	Yes
7121	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shurgot, Michael W.	Yes
7122	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mulcahy, Tina	Yes
7123	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ohlenkamp, Kris	Yes
7124	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Desmet, Larissa	Yes
7125	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shumen, John D	No
7126	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Latham, Judith C	No
7127	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Kovatch, Laura A	Yes
7128	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Trunnell, Debbie	Yes
7129	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Toups, Tiffany	Yes
7130	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Laing, Penelope	Yes
7131	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Anderson, Yvonne	Yes
7132	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Crotty, Megan	Yes
7133	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Randolff, Jens	Yes
7134	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Staszsky, Ruth A	Yes
7135	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	wilcoxson, david	Yes
7136	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tucker, Rosemary	Yes
7137	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boud, Patricia	Yes
7138	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Helmer, Jake	Yes
7139	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hill, Jeffery	Yes
7140	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moniuszko, Jordan	Yes
7141	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reed, Clinton	Yes
7142	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Guernsey, Donna	Yes
7143	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Consagra, Kathy	Yes
7144	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Myers, Kevin	Yes
7145	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Martin, April	Yes
7146	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gibbs, Nicole	Yes
7147	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sanford, Tim	Yes
7148	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fraber, Christina	Yes
7149	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weber, Ron	Yes
7150	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mock, Susan	Yes
7151	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Powell, Judith	Yes
7152	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wolf Bass, Patti	Yes
7153	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barghout, Lynn	Yes
7154	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Juba, Anne	Yes
7155	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Copithorn, Frederik	Yes
7156	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Phillips, Joseph	Yes
7157	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Melanie	Yes
7158	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sullivan, Clark	Yes
7159	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gold, J.	Yes

0008621

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7160	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Corey, Brenda	Yes
7161	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mann, Mary	Yes
7162	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hsieh, Ellie	Yes
7163	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ohler, Lisa	Yes
7164	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scarborough, Savannah	Yes
7165	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Desmond, Angela	Yes
7166	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Raper, Connie	Yes
7167	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Jennifer	Yes
7168	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pugh, Sharon	Yes
7169	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shah, Nandita	Yes
7170	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Adrian	Yes
7171	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gough, Carlene	Yes
7172	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cornelia, Jared	Yes
7173	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lambert, Bettina	Yes
7174	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mikkelsen, David	Yes
7175	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lentz, Susan	Yes
7176	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Babst, Christina	Yes
7177	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Jane	Yes
7178	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bunting, Kristen	Yes
7179	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reynolds, Kevin	Yes
7180	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fent, Sherry	Yes
7181	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zerefos, Stephen	Yes
7182	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bush, Nancy	Yes
7183	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanley, Denise	Yes
7184	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wong, Diane	Yes
7185	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hartgraves, Paula	Yes
7186	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Levering, Edmund	Yes
7187	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carson, Carol	Yes
7188	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Timothy	Yes
7189	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Childs, Nathaniel	Yes
7190	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rathbone, Marjorie	Yes
7191	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		van Dorsten, Peter H	No
7192	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, Lynn	No
7193	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Prescott III, James C	Yes
7194	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elliott, Lynn	Yes
7195	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Susie	Yes
7196	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Armao, Terri	Yes
7197	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Frazier, David	Yes
7198	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scott, Raina	Yes
7199	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thorpe, Tori	Yes
7200	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Wendy	Yes
7201	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fine, Michael	Yes
7202	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cogdell, Crystal	Yes
7203	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bracken, Fay	Yes
7204	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rahlf, Annegret	Yes
7205	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Palacky, Tami	Yes
7206	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Knockemus, Steven	Yes
7207	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Garcia, Armando A	No
7208	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stevens, Kimberly	Yes
7209	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mgraff, Kathleen	Yes
7210	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wood, Cynthia	Yes
7211	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mitchell, Clint	Yes
7212	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hayes, Jamese	Yes

0008622

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7213	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Robinson, Lemuel	Yes
7214	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Snell, Tracy	Yes
7215	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Downey, Josephine	Yes
7216	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Poolos, Hazel	Yes
7217	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lenz, Lynette	Yes
7218	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Armstrong, Paul	Yes
7219	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dickinson, Robert	No
7220	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cato, Lizzie	Yes
7221	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Prediger, Lynda	Yes
7222	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fluharty, Amie	Yes
7223	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schmidlen, Brenda	Yes
7224	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Force, Linda	Yes
7225	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sanders, Michele	Yes
7226	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	BUCHANAN, RACHEL	Yes
7227	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Simmer, Heather	Yes
7228	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reeb, Sue	Yes
7229	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		mankowski, craig s	No
7230	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ucko, Aaron M	Yes
7231	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Avery, Sara	Yes
7232	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Marcus, Christina	No
7233	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Knight, James A	No
7234	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		spakowski, jeff	No
7235	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Greenwood, James G	No
7236	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Selvage, Kimberly	No
7237	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Endangered Habitats League	Silver, Dan	No
7238	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Silvey, Kevin	No
7239	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7240	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fredsti, Dana	No
7241	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Espritus	Kelsonpetit, Ross	Yes
7242	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gaebe, Gail	No
7243	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reynolds, Jonelle	No
7244	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Klausing, Michael L	No
7245	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7246	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Deal, Jeffrey G	No
7247	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Macdonald, Lisa	No
7248	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fuchs, Heidi	Yes
7249	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kramer, Kelly A	No
7250	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Citizen	Schmitt, David J	No
7251	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7252	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McGill, Ron J	Yes
7253	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hopkins, Amy	No
7254	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lopez, Katherine	Yes
7255	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sweet Briar College	Alexander, Sheila K	Yes
7256	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7257	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Tatum, Beth	No
7258	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sivesind, Torunn	Yes
7259	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dann, Laurie	Yes
7260	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7261	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tessler, Samuel	Yes
7262	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maus, Virginia	Yes
7263	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goody, Jessica	Yes
7264	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Lawrence E	Yes
7265	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Standard, Steven	Yes
7266	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Dianne	Yes
7267	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Noctor, Stephen C	Yes
7268	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Torres, Gianna	Yes

0008623

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7269	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morris, Wanda	Yes
7270	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meehan, Robert	Yes
7271	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Keiser, John L	No
7272	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McGoldrick, Bill	No
7273	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7274	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7275	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lerner, B.	Yes
7276	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Libert, Louis	Yes
7277	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mahon, Penny	Yes
7278	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kallander, Jane	Yes
7279	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ulmer, Joseph	Yes
7280	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jonas, Michael	Yes
7281	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kimball, 2005nfg@sbcglobal.net	Yes
7282	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wadsworth, Don and Gwenn L	No
7283	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyda, Mary	No
7284	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Antrim, Craig	Yes
7285	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alexander-Thomson, Kim	Yes
7286	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Greg	Yes
7287	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilman, Cynthia	Yes
7288	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoisington, Chuck	No
7289	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	groom, gene	Yes
7290	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rheder, Richard	Yes
7291	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolf, Wesley	Yes
7292	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lurie-Janicki, Ellaine	No
7293	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Shawn	Yes
7294	5/7/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	Hudson Valley Windsurfers	McDonnell, Mike	Yes
7295	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Oswald, Sarah	No
7296	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thurston, Jennifer	Yes
7297	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	MacPherson, Amber	Yes
7298	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wingate, Julie	No
7299	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Doyle, PK -	Yes
7300	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Educator	DeBruton, Noel C	No
7301	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Spear, Todd	Yes
7302	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meyer, Patricia	Yes
7303	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Starwood, Janet	Yes
7304	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Linda	Yes
7305	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mountjoy, Jan	Yes
7306	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ciavarella, Theresa	Yes
7307	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill III, James R.	Yes
7308	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Zawaski, Joan	No
7309	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Saito, Don M	No
7310	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7311	5/7/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual	University of Illinois	Czajkowski, Carol L	Yes
7312	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRDC, Defenders of Wildlife, Sierra Club	Embler, Kyle	Yes
7313	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mackewich, Susan	No
7314	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		malone, judith a	No
7315	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Chessa Rae	Yes
7316	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Livermore, Lori	Yes
7317	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Petlack, Howard	Yes
7318	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barella, Frank M	No
7319	5/7/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Esposito, Dan J	No
7320	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ziolkowski, Melanie	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7321	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		holmes, ellen	Yes
7322	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		dawson, dan	No
7323	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Matusek, Lynda	No
7324	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7325	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Albert, Anthony	Yes
7326	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Cram, Gregory	Yes
7327	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7328	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7329	5/7/2010	Potential (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		German, Dennis	Yes
7330	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Craig, Ella M	No
7331	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, David G	No
7332	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Webb, Kimberly	No
7333	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Prentice, Sister Letitia	No
7334	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Margeson, Don W	No
7335	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Suzanne	No
7336	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Terhune, Greg	No
7337	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Peck, Naomi	No
7338	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schick, Laurie S	Yes
7339	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Backman, Karen Hedwig	No
7340	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Steckervetz, Lori L	No
7341	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ruiz, O. E	No
7342	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Guido, James	Yes
7343	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Galante, Dorothy C	Yes
7344	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bremigan, Ralph	Yes
7345	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mantas, Nicholas A	No
7346	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7347	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rane, Toby	Yes
7348	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pappert, Edward B	Yes
7349	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7350	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7351	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Potucek, Kimberly A	No
7352	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Putnam, Andrew	No
7353	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mead, Robert	Yes
7354	5/7/2010	No	Business	Strikeout Studio	Gannon, john F. f	No
7355	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		krick, jessica	No
7356	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Morris, Eric	Yes
7357	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gay, Larry	No
7358	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Burch, Robert J	No
7359	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Snyder, William H	No
7360	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dickey, Charles	No
7361	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Niesman, Diane L	No
7362	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cote, Honorie	No
7363	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Nancy	Yes
7364	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7365	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Terrain.org: A Journal of the Built & Natural Environments	Buntin, Simmons B	Yes
7366	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7367	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Doyle, Molly K	Yes
7368	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7369	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7370	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smedira, Carrie F	No

0008625

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7371	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	a member of the National Parks Conservation Association	Greenberg, Jon M	Yes
7372	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Finholt, Tom E	Yes
7373	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schollenberger, Craig R	No
7374	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Fiorentino, Doris	No
7375	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Paul, Mark D	No
7376	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kleber, Tracey L	Yes
7377	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, Felicia C	Yes
7378	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	california parks association	mcnamara, kevin m	No
7379	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Olson, Steve	Yes
7380	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Stellner, Richard	Yes
7381	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7382	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mandell-Rice, Bonnie S	No
7383	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Larson, Pat	No
7384	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		odonnell, frank o	Yes
7385	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		laurie, annie	No
7386	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Garrett, Sandra	No
7387	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sanford, William	Yes
7388	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mungle, Terri	Yes
7389	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Phillips, Richard J	No
7390	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Morocco, Carol	No
7391	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	LaCroix, Catherine	Yes
7392	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7393	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wagner, Vickie M	No
7394	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	oakland university	gilson, annette m	No
7395	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Aegerter, Bob	No
7396	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Winter, Blake K	Yes
7397	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kleindenst, Fred c	No
7398	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Simone, Beverly	Yes
7399	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kelley, jane E	No
7400	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grimm, Barton	Yes
7401	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKee, Margot A	Yes
7402	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Coffin, David	Yes
7403	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	butenschoen, van w	No
7404	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McNamara, Robert	Yes
7405	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fraser, Evelyn	Yes
7406	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGill, Ann C	No
7407	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Van Kolken, Bob	Yes
7408	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Vultaggio, Richard	Yes
7409	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dobbs, Michael	No
7410	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Senour, Jon	No
7411	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Batchelor, S	No
7412	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Powers, Janet M	No
7413	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Vela, Michelle	Yes
7414	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Conservation Association	Foulk, Jacqueline	Yes
7415	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Willcox, Christopher	Yes
7416	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kellogg, Caroline	No
7417	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hill, Chrisandra	Yes
7418	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NARFE	Tross, Marilyn M	Yes
7419	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Napier, Warren S	Yes
7420	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wallace, Linda	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7421	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peters, Kevin	Yes
7422	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Wyatt, Cathy E	Yes
7423	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		robey, valerie	No
7424	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Payne, David	Yes
7425	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Asso	Peterson, Susan	No
7426	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservative Association	Long Crow, Kelly D	No
7427	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schunck , Tobias P	No
7428	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Woodcock, Charlene M	Yes
7429	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Saulter, A	No
7430	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		May, Evelyn & Leopold	Yes
7431	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Jayme S	No
7432	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		LEALI, ROBERT P	No
7433	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	West Valley Interfaith Project	Orlinski, Patricia	No
7434	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Darling, Mary	Yes
7435	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kennedy, Arthur	No
7436	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Baumgartner, Helen	Yes
7437	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Link, John J	No
7438	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Gerbas, Joyce	Yes
7439	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stitt, Bryan J	No
7440	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Webb, Terry L	No
7441	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Cheesemans' Ecology Safaris	Cheeseman, Ted	No
7442	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		williams, deb	Yes
7443	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cypherd, Victoria A	No
7444	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7445	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Costley, Maya	Yes
7446	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parksd Conservation Association	Bales, Mark	Yes
7447	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peloquen MD, James L	No
7448	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lapointe, Eric	No
7449	5/7/2010	Potential (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Eichler, Nancy	Yes
7450	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Raper, Connie K	No
7451	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Deal, John R	No
7452	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fay, Robert H	No
7453	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	LaVerne, David A	Yes
7454	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Modisette, Holly A	No
7455	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Bell, Denise C	No
7456	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Messing, Mark	Yes
7457	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miles, Margaret s	No
7458	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Elliott, Lynn M	No
7459	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NCPA	Schmitz, Mary Jude F	No
7460	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Write Ink	Pehme, Kalev	No
7461	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Koloze, Kathy	No
7462	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swem, Virginia L	No
7463	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Delevoryas, Prof. John	Yes
7464	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Whitesides, Marilyn	Yes
7465	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones-Umberger, Stanley	No
7466	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Romanowski, Scott	Yes
7467	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Banik, Lisa	No
7468	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CA State Parks Foundation	Rogers, Connie	No
7469	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008627

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7470	5/7/2010	Potential (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Laura	No
7471	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Costello, Edward J	Yes
7472	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyon, RoseMary	Yes
7473	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Franchi, Irena	No
7474	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Brown, Russell	Yes
7475	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		crampton, vicky	No
7476	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Herron, Andria	Yes
7477	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Klucsor, Carmen A	No
7478	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gobely, Michelle	No
7479	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	American Canoe Association	Stehlin, Sandra R	No
7480	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robinson, Paul	No
7481	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		riger, richard	No
7482	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Desmond, Angela M	No
7483	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Simmons, Roberta M	Yes
7484	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7485	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Suthers, James	Yes
7486	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7487	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Frank	Yes
7488	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Napolitano, Katherine	Yes
7489	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Halderson, Cynthia	Yes
7490	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Tomashevsky, Robert	No
7491	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Gault, Carol A	No
7492	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilke, Cathy L	No
7493	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Warner, Christopher M	No
7494	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mason, Lynelle	No
7495	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zimmermann, John	Yes
7496	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Willife Federation	Walker, Carol I	No
7497	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brangan, Sarah	No
7498	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Loeb, Rema	No
7499	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weyand, Mike	No
7500	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7501	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cagle, Nicolette	Yes
7502	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Katz, David	Yes
7503	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Ivy Academy	Watson, Jim	No
7504	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Knabe, Kari K	Yes
7505	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	90-north	Kokoris, Moki	No
7506	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Drewelow, Jerry A	Yes
7507	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7508	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Challacombe, Joanna L	Yes
7509	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weeks, Mandy A	No
7510	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Minton, Mark A	Yes
7511	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		DiPasquale, Denise M	No
7512	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Garvey, Jenna E	Yes
7513	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caldwell, James	No
7514	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Doner, John P	No
7515	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Frohn, Joyce	No
7516	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7517	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pacelli, Carol	Yes
7518	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Summers, Jim	Yes
7519	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		White, Amy	Yes
7520	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7521	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7522	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Machinists Union	Williams, Charlie	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7523	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lemus, Julia L	Yes
7524	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kayan, Helmut	Yes
7525	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Casperson, Carolina	Yes
7526	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moser, Eugene	Yes
7527	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Sandra	Yes
7528	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dodd, Gordon	No
7529	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wright, Allison	Yes
7530	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		evans, idinda s	Yes
7531	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Logan, Alice	Yes
7532	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Theod, April	Yes
7533	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Knott, Thomas	No
7534	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGarrity, Tom	Yes
7535	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lavender, Shell	Yes
7536	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, Robert	No
7537	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		bochert, Carol J	Yes
7538	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mikolajczyk, Lisabeth	Yes
7539	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hunt, Jill B	No
7540	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Juknalis, Barbara	Yes
7541	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Karrothi, Uday C	Yes
7542	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Terran	Doak, Hartson	No
7543	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Steve	No
7544	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Winner, Angelika	Yes
7545	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	npca	brewer, molly a	Yes
7546	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kucek, Peg	Yes
7547	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, Dane	Yes
7548	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Van Praag, Jane L	No
7549	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Panek, Jill	Yes
7550	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pacey-Field, Susan L	No
7551	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7552	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Roe, Christina	No
7553	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rea, Michael	No
7554	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bundy, Jennifer	No
7555	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schreier, Marguerite C	No
7556	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	University of La Verne	Jones, Jay	No
7557	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Samp, Cecelia	No
7558	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Ben	No
7559	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kawaler, Lydia	Yes
7560	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pucak, Carol J	No
7561	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Cleveland, Robert	No
7562	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association and Many other environment organizations	Leggett, Dee	Yes
7563	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Clark, Michele	Yes
7564	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	strahan, estha g	Yes
7565	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	N/A, N/A	No
7566	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Sanford, Timothy R	No
7567	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pettit, Lana	Yes
7568	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	White Rose Catholic Worker	Bambrick, John	No
7569	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Lynne, Sandra K	Yes
7570	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7571	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McAnulty, Richard	Yes
7572	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Caltech	Lee, Toni M	Yes
7573	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		grissom, ruth ann	No
7574	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Logan, William O	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7575	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc.	Conrad, Norm	No
7576	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gompers, Shelley M	Yes
7577	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		platt, audrey	No
7578	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nixon, James T	No
7579	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7580	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Trimble, Peggy	No
7581	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Garcia, Mary	No
7582	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Jensen, Donna	Yes
7583	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hennessey, Chris	Yes
7584	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Lovejoy, Patricia M	No
7585	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pavese, Robert R	No
7586	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cornelia, Jared	No
7587	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Worcester, Chris	No
7588	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spaulding, Stephen J	No
7589	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Daiss, Becky	No
7590	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Engel, Gordon R	No
7591	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bal, Samuel S	Yes
7592	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7593	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	sierra club and national parks conservation association	Marancik, David	Yes
7594	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cornelia, Jared	No
7595	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7596	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		VanLandingham, Mike	Yes
7597	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Noel, Letitia	No
7598	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Echols, Burks	Yes
7599	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Racer, Michael J	Yes
7600	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Deming, Jennifer	Yes
7601	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Benjamin, James L	No
7602	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7603	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Durrenberger, Joe	No
7604	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Amsden, Liz	No
7605	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shemo Jr, Matthew M	Yes
7606	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carley, Dan and Ellen	Yes
7607	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gibboney, Roberta K	Yes
7608	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Aughey, Arlene	No
7609	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Morgan, Linda G	No
7610	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		graham, Susan K	Yes
7611	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Donna E	No
7612	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rosenthal, Ann	No
7613	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rubel, Scott	No
7614	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Long, Patricia B	Yes
7615	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Bunting, Kyle A	Yes
7616	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Suter, Lindsay S	Yes
7617	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dunham, Christopher	No
7618	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7619	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neill, Erin	No
7620	5/7/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Merciez, Timothy N	Yes
7621	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Beaven, Nancie	No
7622	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Doss, Heide M	Yes
7623	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7624	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cox, B. Lea	No
7625	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reid, Cheryl G	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7626	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7627	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc.	White, Mary M	Yes
7628	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kaplan, David A	No
7629	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Maher, Jane C	Yes
7630	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		mckeen, samuel	Yes
7631	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Natl Parks Conservation Assn	Norris, Joanne W	No
7632	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Warden, Rich	Yes
7633	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	None	Moran, Denise	Yes
7634	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Purcell, Regina G	No
7635	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7636	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		scharf, william c	No
7637	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Frederick, Gwen A	No
7638	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Turner, Kathleen M	Yes
7639	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moore, Bill	Yes
7640	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7641	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnes, Aegina	Yes
7642	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	EduShift, Inc.	Will, David	No
7643	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Day, Linda A	No
7644	5/7/2010	No	Business	Wild Horizons Publishing, Inc.	Wiewandt, Thomas A	No
7645	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7646	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Franco, Diana	Yes
7647	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Ryan, Kevin W	Yes
7648	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Cullen, Dale	No
7649	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Henry, Devin	No
7650	5/7/2010	Master (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7651	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		George, M.S.	No
7652	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Roemer, Michael	Yes
7653	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brust, Angela C	No
7654	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Webb, Jeanette	No
7655	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Jackson, Warren	Yes
7656	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Jewell, Wendy M	Yes
7657	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neill, Cara H	Yes
7658	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Christiane	Yes
7659	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7660	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		miller, russell h	No
7661	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7662	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	WWF	Darrow, Delana R	No
7663	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	sall, frederick w	Yes
7664	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wang, Kevin	Yes
7665	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	n/a	LaFlamme, Jeff P	No
7666	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	World Wildlife	Hinrichs, Pamela J	No
7667	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Knapp, Michael A	Yes
7668	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Becky L	Yes
7669	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sabo, Judith L	No
7670	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McQuigg, Catherine	Yes
7671	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Plouffe, Darrell R	Yes
7672	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Harry K	Yes
7673	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7674	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bowden, Robin W	Yes
7675	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robinson-Anderson, Randa c	Yes
7676	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7677	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hill, Kimberly J	No

0008631

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7678	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tranberg, Debra M	No
7679	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sunde Jr, Robert J	No
7680	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Elske	Yes
7681	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Branson, C A	Yes
7682	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yingling, Jacob	No
7683	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilbert, Sandy J	No
7684	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Moore, Catherine A	Yes
7685	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Gehman, Betsy & Steve	No
7686	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Natioinal Parks Conservation Association	Starr, Andrew	No
7687	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brumby, Val	Yes
7688	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stewarat, Geraldine	Yes
7689	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sudi McCollum Design	McCollum, Sudi	Yes
7690	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ostrom, Gavin A	No
7691	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Watson, John S	No
7692	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7693	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Souza, Julie	No
7694	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Andersson, Linda L	No
7695	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Little, Vicki L	No
7696	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7697	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kirsch, Kristin	Yes
7698	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7699	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7700	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Markowitz, John C	No
7701	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Douglas, Dianne	Yes
7702	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rosenfield, Ralph R	No
7703	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Feemster, Gary W	Yes
7704	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoch, Elizabeth A	No
7705	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sopala, Laurence V	No
7706	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7707	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Cowan, Donald J	Yes
7708	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7709	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Reinhardt, Karl David	Yes
7710	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gintz, Aimee J	No
7711	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Flewitt, Claire	Yes
7712	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	npca	Epperson, Joseph L	Yes
7713	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Schueth, Steve	No
7714	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Strohmayr, Florence M	Yes
7715	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7716	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Bear Meadow	Wilder, Dwain	No
7717	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Strawser, Liliane J	Yes
7718	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		bullard, debbie l	No
7719	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7720	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Marett, John D	Yes
7721	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		meier, rich	No
7722	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fahy, Elizabeth	No
7723	5/7/2010	Master (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Artin, Thomas	No
7724	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Gorrin, Eugene	Yes
7725	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Wylie, Michael	Yes
7726	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Delehant, Raymond	Yes
7727	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008632

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7728	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Maddox, Charles E	No
7729	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Foster, Nancy C	Yes
7730	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, William	Yes
7731	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lynch, Lisa	Yes
7732	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bennett, Virginia	Yes
7733	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Laughlin, Peter G	Yes
7734	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Schneider, Allyn S	No
7735	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Redlien, Neil	Yes
7736	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Edge, Anne	Yes
7737	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Adrian, Lee	Yes
7738	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Church, Philip	Yes
7739	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rauschert, Lara	Yes
7740	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Deller, Steven	Yes
7741	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Strayer, Karen	Yes
7742	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Palm, Paul	Yes
7743	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brunick, Cathy	Yes
7744	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Glahn, Herb	Yes
7745	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	national parks conservation assn	Sidelman, Raphael	Yes
7746	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tody, Mary	Yes
7747	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Campbell, Margaret	Yes
7748	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Roberts, Anne	Yes
7749	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Leslie	Yes
7750	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jaslow, Douglas	Yes
7751	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Davis, Millisa	Yes
7752	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hammond, Stephanie	Yes
7753	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoskin, Cornelia	Yes
7754	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hawes, Dena	Yes
7755	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moser, Gene	Yes
7756	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cassell, Lara	Yes
7757	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Triolo, Sandy	Yes
7758	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Tidwell, Robert D	Yes
7759	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marshall, Robert T	No
7760	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Richard	Yes
7761	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reynolds, Ken	Yes
7762	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Armstrong, Frances	Yes
7763	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leineweber, Stephanie	Yes
7764	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shirer, Lindsey	Yes
7765	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Subramanian, Mahadevan	Yes
7766	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pitts, Terri	Yes
7767	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lewis, Kevin	Yes
7768	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Surmay, Lori M	No
7769	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Baughman, Carol	No
7770	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lubomirski, Joseph	Yes
7771	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, N/A	Yes
7772	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelsen, Judith	Yes
7773	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hotchkiss, Mark	Yes
7774	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mueller, Sally C	No
7775	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Tax Payer	Roberson, Rick W	Yes
7776	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Gaenolee S	Yes
7777	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hassett, Todd	No

0008633

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7778	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7779	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Berg, Peter	No
7780	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, N/A	No
7781	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kowalewski, Douglas	No
7782	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCarty, Natasha R	No
7783	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Olander, Alan	No
7784	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cummins, Diana	Yes
7785	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thompson, Doreen	Yes
7786	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crawford, A.	Yes
7787	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cullen, Vanessa	Yes
7788	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dressel, Michael	Yes
7789	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adams, Nancy	Yes
7790	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crowley, Lawrence	Yes
7791	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilsdorf, Helen	Yes
7792	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Preuss, G.	Yes
7793	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Watson, John	Yes
7794	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ford, Carol	Yes
7795	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Benson, Mary Kay	Yes
7796	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Persico, Donna	Yes
7797	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mendez, Carolina	Yes
7798	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeSena, Mary	Yes
7799	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7800	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamilton, Dr. Barbara and Mr. Tom	Yes
7801	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Glass, Becky	Yes
7802	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Adriana	No
7803	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hawkins, Mary	Yes
7804	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Meisner, Lora	No
7805	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		smith, ian	No
7806	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Harvard	Siegrist, Toni M	Yes
7807	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kern, Alicia J	Yes
7808	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brodie, Deborah	Yes
7809	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7810	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Albano, Louis G	No
7811	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lima, Paul	No
7812	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Norquist, Raun	No
7813	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Chalker, Mikki R	Yes
7814	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Forschner, Jillian	Yes
7815	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spangler, John D	Yes
7816	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Pax Christi USA	Rowan, Thomas J	No
7817	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Miller, Donna A	Yes
7818	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Norkus, Edward	No
7819	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carter, Pat	No
7820	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tarr, Richard	No
7821	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club etc.	Harris, Ann S	No
7822	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		francis, kirk h	Yes
7823	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		pierce, patrick g	No
7824	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Charland, Chadd C	No
7825	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rubino, Karen	Yes
7826	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NCPA	McGinley, Margaret	Yes
7827	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reed, Michael	Yes
7828	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stadnik, George	No
7829	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7830	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Duckworth, Ron	No
7831	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008634

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7832	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Vasily, Karen	No
7833	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Casper, Chris	Yes
7834	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stutes, Earl A	No
7835	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Wanda	No
7836	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Marques, Audrey	Yes
7837	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reisman, Emil	No
7838	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7839	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	wick, jodi L	No
7840	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Adkins, Mandi R	Yes
7841	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kuligowski, rebecca a	No
7842	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		gerichter, leona	Yes
7843	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Eleanor B	Yes
7844	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, N/A	No
7845	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7846	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Doles, Robert T	Yes
7847	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7848	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bielecki, Clara L	Yes
7849	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ferguson, Charlene A	Yes
7850	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kaufmann, Robin C	Yes
7851	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carlson, Alan L	No
7852	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hathaway, Susan	No
7853	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Hart, Mary	Yes
7854	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Hesselink, Joanne	Yes
7855	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Markgraf, Steven	No
7856	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stern, Kalika	Yes
7857	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tarbox, Bryan C	Yes
7858	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7859	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crawford, Gayle	No
7860	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Baker, Richard G	No
7861	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Blackshear, Sherry	No
7862	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Graver, Chuck E	No
7863	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Veterans For Peace	Tylenda, Elton W	No
7864	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Eversoll, Anne Q	Yes
7865	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McNeil, Lewis P	Yes
7866	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Belulovich, R A	Yes
7867	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7868	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wechsler, Susan	No
7869	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Roberts, Barry W	No
7870	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7871	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Targon, Elvira M	No
7872	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vactor, Alex	Yes
7873	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ebershoff-Coles, Susan	No
7874	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		egleston, pat	Yes
7875	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		VAN_WAGNEN, HEIDI	No
7876	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miner, Samuel	No
7877	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Decker, Mary Gail	No
7878	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGuire, Tim M	No
7879	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Hudson, Patricia	Yes
7880	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7881	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA (National Parks Conservation Association)	Michalowski, Joe D	No
7882	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dennehy, Kelly	Yes
7883	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Galen	Yes
7884	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7885	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shea, Steven P	Yes
7886	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Arth, David a	No
7887	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hydeman, Jinx	Yes
7888	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, Catherine	No
7889	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Fanok, Scott	Yes
7890	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Curran, Angela	Yes
7891	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Fredrickson, John	No
7892	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vician, Doris	Yes
7893	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Shiebler, Chuck	No
7894	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7895	5/7/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Black, Angela	No
7896	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dupps, John A	Yes
7897	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		THAMES, JOEL E	No
7898	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sayre, Cari	Yes
7899	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	just a person who cares	noble, ann c	Yes
7900	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7901	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Grubb, Karen Y	No
7902	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cowan, Barry	Yes
7903	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Wingo, Kaylyn	No
7904	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilcox, James	Yes
7905	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fletcher, Karen R	Yes
7906	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Northland College	Stewart, Dr. John M	No
7907	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Seibert, Bob	No
7908	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Farrington, Raymond	No
7909	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Burby, Leslie K	Yes
7910	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kolkey, MFT, Zora L	No
7911	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		West, Derek R	Yes
7912	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc	Sparlin, Shauna	Yes
7913	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	MLs	N/A, N/A	No
7914	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7915	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heidenreich, Ralph L	Yes
7916	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ager, bev	Yes
7917	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schoemer, Karen	No
7918	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7919	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		B, Jeremiah	No
7920	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Moveon.org	Stowell, Richard P	Yes
7921	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	SCHOLL, Marilee	Yes
7922	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7923	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thompson, Gudrun	Yes
7924	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7925	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Daly, Julia	No
7926	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7927	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		walter, gail L	Yes
7928	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hanzel, Diane	Yes
7929	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7930	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fugate, Peggy A	Yes
7931	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Nancy	No
7932	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7933	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Dupps, Frank N	Yes

0008636

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7934	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Feeley, Janet	No
7935	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kupke, Mark	Yes
7936	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Young, Nancy L L	No
7937	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7938	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7939	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7940	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7941	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hubbard, James	No
7942	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Sinclair, Michael C	Yes
7943	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hughes, Andrew	No
7944	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Potter, Sondra E	No
7945	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7946	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Voska, Kenneth J	No
7947	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7948	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ertelt, Jonathan	Yes
7949	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Morgan, Linda M	Yes
7950	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Falcone, Janet	Yes
7951	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Balaguer, Nancy S	Yes
7952	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rozelle, Allen	Yes
7953	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Wildlife Federation	Mecke, Mike B	No
7954	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7955	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bowie, Jennifer	Yes
7956	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stearns, Joan E	No
7957	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Morotti , Gloria J	No
7958	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	McChesney, Tim	No
7959	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		craciun, george J	No
7960	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7961	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cohen, Norman	No
7962	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Armistead, Susan C	No
7963	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mendez, Carlos	No
7964	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Knockemus, Steve	No
7965	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Conservation Ass'n	Wedlock, Eldon D	No
7966	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schmidt, Willa E	Yes
7967	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kitchens, Bruce P	Yes
7968	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Murbach, Randy	No
7969	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Anderson, William D	No
7970	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schaefer, Robin	Yes
7971	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gowens, Edward L	Yes
7972	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dennis, Steve C	No
7973	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, David A	Yes
7974	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Isbell, Linda	Yes
7975	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Albers, Linda	Yes
7976	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Thorsen, Jean	Yes
7977	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Heathcoat, Elaine A	No
7978	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brebner, Linda B	Yes
7979	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wood, Barbara L	No
7980	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Elsaesser, Dorothy J	Yes
7981	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Jim	Yes
7982	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NWF	Laurson, Ed J	No
7983	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Neary, Pat	Yes
7984	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelemen, Frank	No
7985	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Matheny, MaryJo H	No
7986	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Foresman, Cynthia M	Yes

0008637

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
7987	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kautz, Katherine M	Yes
7988	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7989	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
7990	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Pick, Charles	Yes
7991	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barber, Terry L	No
7992	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Presbyterian Church	Coddington, Tom L	No
7993	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Janssen Eager, Denise	Yes
7994	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Pax Christi	Hefner, Patricia M	Yes
7995	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
7996	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Lafaver Gleason, Barbara L	Yes
7997	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Farmer, Betsy H	No
7998	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hines, Nolan F	No
7999	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8000	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	npca	flannery, rebecca g	No
8001	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kenagy, David	No
8002	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hartman, Kathleen E	No
8003	5/7/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Norhwest Motorcycle Association	Petersen, Tod L	No
8004	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Conrad, William G	No
8005	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	The Wilderness Society	N/A, N/A	Yes
8006	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Baratta, Eric	No
8007	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sheridan, Theresa	No
8008	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Ryan, Beth A	Yes
8009	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lovejoy, Nancy S	No
8010	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Epshteyn, Aneah	No
8011	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Farnsworth, Christina M	Yes
8012	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Juhl, Brandon P	Yes
8013	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Gifford, Judith J	Yes
8014	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Owens, Katherine A	Yes
8015	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Herrera, Fabian	No
8016	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gregory, T	Yes
8017	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Species, Scott	No
8018	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8019	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Montapert, Anthony	No
8020	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swanson, Gerald C	No
8021	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Goodman, Alice	No
8022	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	individual	Burianek, Linda B	Yes
8023	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bridgewater, Paul N	Yes
8024	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8025	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Conservation Assn	Devine, William S	Yes
8026	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, Eugene	Yes
8027	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8028	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mit5chell, N/A	No
8029	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Polacca, Brenda	No
8030	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rands, Gordon P	No
8031	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Alicandu-Thurman, Maria G	No
8032	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Petty, Carlene L	No
8033	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8034	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8035	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pearlman, Jeff	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8036	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hustvedt, Annie M	No
8037	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Hofing, Amy L	No
8038	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gorr, Richard	No
8039	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		rinaldo, jean	No
8040	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Garden Club of America	Roth, Suzanne M	Yes
8041	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Wildlife Federation	Bowman, Elizabeth B	Yes
8042	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	IWW	Ongerth, Steve	No
8043	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8044	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8045	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cosgrove, Christine	No
8046	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hartholz, Steven B	No
8047	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8048	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Valle, Jose	Yes
8049	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Copithorn, Fred H	No
8050	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	McClellan, Henrietta D	Yes
8051	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Hale, Angela E	No
8052	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoff, Michelle L	No
8053	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Monroe Science Educational Services	Monroe, James R	No
8054	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Craib, Jim	No
8055	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8056	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Glover, Robert	Yes
8057	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Malley, Karen A	No
8058	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8059	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Holloway, Heather	No
8060	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shorin, Robert	No
8061	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Germain, Thomas	No
8062	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gach, Andrew	No
8063	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Draper, Barry	No
8064	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hall, Silvia A	No
8065	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation	Robinson, Alison M	Yes
8066	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8067	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Craig, Eugene H	Yes
8068	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hed, Scott J	Yes
8069	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		sailer, randy	No
8070	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McCombs, Robert E	Yes
8071	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Starr, David S	No
8072	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8073	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kranz, David L	No
8074	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Wildlife Fed	Evans, Theodosia	Yes
8075	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Natioinal Parks Member	lomascolo, suzanne m	No
8076	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Frymoyer, Allison A	No
8077	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Selwood, Lydia F	No
8078	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8079	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	stelacio, maria	Yes
8080	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8081	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swain, John D	No
8082	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mitchell, N/A	No
8083	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McMullen, Ann	No
8084	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008639

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8085	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8086	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coates, Betty	Yes
8087	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Venezia, John	Yes
8088	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bryce, Letitia	Yes
8089	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Steffen, Robert	Yes
8090	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vallet, Sonya	Yes
8091	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Porterfield, J	Yes
8092	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Edmonds, Ashley	Yes
8093	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burch, Lilian	Yes
8094	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kochis, Jim	No
8095	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mullin, Richard	Yes
8096	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Matthew	Yes
8097	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dalgliesh, Amy	Yes
8098	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dornan, Patricia	Yes
8099	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boukamel, Susane	Yes
8100	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Freeman, Alyssa	Yes
8101	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burgevin, Stephanie	Yes
8102	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hasty, Josh	Yes
8103	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burchfiel, Linda	Yes
8104	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cooke, Brenda	Yes
8105	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Herman	Yes
8106	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8107	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Koehler, Susan	Yes
8108	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McNeil, L Philip	Yes
8109	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Onorato, Janet	Yes
8110	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tompkins, Malinda	Yes
8111	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Matos, Kathy	Yes
8112	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Heidel, Chrys	Yes
8113	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whiting, Nonie	Yes
8114	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Kimberly	Yes
8115	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hulkenberg II, Richard	Yes
8116	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association, EarthShare	Laporte, Stephanie L	No
8117	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smouse, Carol	Yes
8118	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Solano, Anthony	Yes
8119	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nims, Julia	Yes
8120	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cawood, Kyle	No
8121	5/7/2010	Yes (428952)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Goodson, Kate	Yes
8122	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burke, Paul	Yes
8123	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Petts, David	Yes
8124	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Panta, Janeth	Yes
8125	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dilonardo, Kathy L	Yes
8126	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Borda, Benjamin	Yes
8127	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gallagher, Sarah W	No
8128	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc.	Spiegel, Karen E	No
8129	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wach, Ottilia A	Yes
8130	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Harrison, Linda C	Yes
8131	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		meany, janet	Yes
8132	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8133	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carlton, Patricia	No
8134	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Pick, Charles	Yes
8135	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8136	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	Corby, Sandra	Yes
8137	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Silver, C.E.P., Ronald	No
8138	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8139	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yerges, John R	No
8140	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Iverson Bedford, Beverly E	No
8141	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Sheryl	Yes
8142	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Breakfield, Sandra	No
8143	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	npca	burley, david m	No
8144	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8145	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Anagnos, Peter	Yes
8146	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Giurleo, Patricia A	No
8147	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Denison, James	Yes
8148	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	LaFond, Laurie	Yes
8149	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Castiano, Judith	Yes
8150	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goff, Frances	Yes
8151	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Steinbrecher, Klaus	Yes
8152	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Paul, Kathy	Yes
8153	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Neilsen, Nancy R	Yes
8154	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wall, Ariadna	Yes
8155	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dennis, Cathy	Yes
8156	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dorfman, Karen	Yes
8157	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Jo-Ann	Yes
8158	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ruedin, Louise	Yes
8159	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siciliano, Ellen	Yes
8160	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pivnick, Anitra	Yes
8161	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DiGirolamo, Paul	No
8162	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ingraham, Mary	Yes
8163	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Conley, Sarah	Yes
8164	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weinberg, Janet	Yes
8165	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ryan, Ashley	Yes
8166	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kucharik, Laurie	Yes
8167	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hutchinson, Dawn	Yes
8168	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Silver, Margaret	No
8169	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		seidelman, susan r	Yes
8170	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Mel	Yes
8171	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roady, Paula	Yes
8172	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fortunato, Nancy	Yes
8173	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelsey, Marion	Yes
8174	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Love, Harry	Yes
8175	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8176	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carse, MaryAnne	No
8177	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ranieri, Nancy	No
8178	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	AMA	Hansen, Stephen	Yes
8179	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8180	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kane, Michael	No
8181	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cummins, Steve	No
8182	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8183	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Dietsch, Keleigh	Yes
8184	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, Ron T	No
8185	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8186	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rhoades, Chuck	No
8187	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Orcholski, Gerald	Yes
8188	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		piaskoski, peter	Yes
8189	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8190	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	McLam, George	Yes
8191	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8192	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bhandari, Christina	Yes

0008641

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8193	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation	Spoentgen, Karen	Yes
8194	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Columbia, James	No
8195	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cike, Carrie	No
8196	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Sarah E	No
8197	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	MFSO	Miranda, Michelle M	Yes
8198	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jackson, Donald L	No
8199	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dorf, Barbara	Yes
8200	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Parsley, Adina	No
8201	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Goodwin, Emily	Yes
8202	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Karls, Kristi	Yes
8203	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		wilke, WENDY C	Yes
8204	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mainelli, Margaret	No
8205	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Cross, Lisa	Yes
8206	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	PEPC	Kantola, Barbara L	No
8207	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McDonald, Susan	No
8208	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Albanese, LaDonna	No
8209	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	United States of America	Dorsey, Mike	No
8210	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	tracker Archaeology Services	cammisa, alfred	Yes
8211	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Flanagan, Dr. James K	Yes
8212	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Hameick, Kendall H	No
8213	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRDC	Vaydik, Frank W	No
8214	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Biby, J.	Yes
8215	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dearborn, Karen J	Yes
8216	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WILBUR, DAVID	No
8217	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	California Polytechnic State University	Arrivee, David	Yes
8218	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8219	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fearey, Patricia	No
8220	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Heikkila, Nicholas E	No
8221	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation	Whitehouse, Judy K	No
8222	5/7/2010	Potential (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wittman, Charles	No
8223	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	EI FOT	donovan, william j	Yes
8224	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Waltasti, Marilyn A	No
8225	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Lupowitz, Martin D	Yes
8226	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Black, Suzanne T	Yes
8227	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kershner, Gail	Yes
8228	5/7/2010	Potential (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8229	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		magdanz, susan	No
8230	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Ross, Sara E	Yes
8231	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Waters, Francis J	Yes
8232	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l. Park Assn	Pieper, Dolores A	Yes
8233	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Willoughby, Judith M	Yes
8234	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Ann	Yes
8235	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Lohn-Tinker, Vivian L	No
8236	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bibuld, Jerome	No
8237	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gillingham, Carol	No
8238	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fortier, Barney	Yes
8239	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Downs, Virginia L	No
8240	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Vallery, Anne	No
8241	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bolton, Jessica L	No
8242	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Hoffman, Lisa B	Yes
8243	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hebberger, Jo Anna	Yes
8244	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jasper, Marilyn	Yes
8245	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mon, Luis	No

0008642

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8246	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mandano, Marie	Yes
8247	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8248	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Wurst, William C	Yes
8249	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mardones, Nano M	Yes
8250	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8251	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hawkins, Adaire A	No
8252	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		D'Ambrosio, Faith	Yes
8253	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Perdios, Dan R	No
8254	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Erickson, Becky	Yes
8255	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Lewis, Elan	Yes
8256	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Wisconsin ENergy Conservation Corp	Kraemer, Honora	No
8257	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Malvick, Helen J	Yes
8258	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Slote, Karen	No
8259	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Higgins, Thomas R	Yes
8260	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cardin, Bennye	Yes
8261	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Graziosa, Sara	Yes
8262	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Montana Wilderness Association	Gloege, Randall G	No
8263	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sadiki, Chala	No
8264	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Otzel, Margaret	No
8265	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8266	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		brown, john c	No
8267	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dominguez, Laura	No
8268	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Gibson, Katherine E	Yes
8269	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bullock, Debbie H	Yes
8270	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Mallardi, Idee L	Yes
8271	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon Society	Ward, Paula K	Yes
8272	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stark, Richard	No
8273	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Winkler, Marjorie J	Yes
8274	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brust, Paul F	Yes
8275	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Anderson, Elisabeth	Yes
8276	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilman, Cynthia	No
8277	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Lyceum Ave	Navarro, Greg	No
8278	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Witmer, John D	No
8279	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Vinz, Michele	No
8280	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Seth, Sandra	Yes
8281	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8282	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudgins, Janet	Yes
8283	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Lohn-Tinker, Vivian L	No
8284	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Falcone, KIM B	Yes
8285	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Frank, Randall	No
8286	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kirby, L	Yes
8287	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8288	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilde, Ronda	Yes
8289	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Logue, Lawrence S	No
8290	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8291	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stewart, Edward G	Yes
8292	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Conley, Jean	Yes
8293	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Arnold, Judith	Yes
8294	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kirschling, Karen	Yes
8295	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008643

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8296	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8297	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bloomer, Jerry	No
8298	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stover, Connie C	Yes
8299	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		steinbach, susan l	No
8300	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8301	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		brunner, frances	Yes
8302	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Karriker-Jaffe, Katherine J	Yes
8303	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Wilson, Pete S	Yes
8304	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whetstone, Tony	No
8305	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wieland, Loren	No
8306	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fischer, Kristin	No
8307	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Conlan, Mike	Yes
8308	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Citizen	Snyder, Helen H	Yes
8309	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		garwood, willard s	No
8310	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Drwinga, Helen L	Yes
8311	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Margolis, Michael	Yes
8312	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Decker, Catherine	Yes
8313	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8314	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caughron, Janna S	Yes
8315	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Glaser, Chris	Yes
8316	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		welde, logan	No
8317	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8318	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Busch, Joanna R	Yes
8319	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Iverson, Steve M	Yes
8320	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		walston, jr, john l	Yes
8321	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kunkel, Ted	No
8322	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Timm, Jill	Yes
8323	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Berman, Rebecca L	No
8324	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lohuis, Mary	Yes
8325	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ritchey, Jr., Albert	Yes
8326	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Christy	Yes
8327	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8328	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Baylor L	No
8329	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moderacki, Deidre	Yes
8330	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wright, Jean	Yes
8331	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Climate SOS	Hoersch, Magdalena H	Yes
8332	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Schlaepfer-Youker, Cynthia J	Yes
8333	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Livingston, James L	Yes
8334	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rogers, Jennifer	No
8335	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoffman, Meredith	Yes
8336	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Poole, Kathryn H	Yes
8337	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wood-Constable, Mary	Yes
8338	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Caudill, Gil	No
8339	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		blank, diana J	Yes
8340	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burnim, Josh	Yes
8341	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leist, William A	Yes
8342	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8343	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sales, Raegan	Yes
8344	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Xander	No
8345	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		freudiger, sabine	Yes
8346	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Norbury, Christopher	Yes

0008644

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8347	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Carson, David E	No
8348	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Schipper, Jane S	No
8349	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pierce, Ann M	Yes
8350	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Steuer, Arthur	Yes
8351	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Greiser, T Weber	Yes
8352	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Croft, Dianne G	No
8353	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Streett, Stacey D	Yes
8354	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Worster, Beverley J	No
8355	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Weathers, Mary B	No
8356	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8357	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8358	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Snyder, Sheri D	No
8359	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8360	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8361	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Braxton, Jesse L	Yes
8362	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nielsen, Ann Z	Yes
8363	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Beavers, Steve	Yes
8364	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Glaser, Frank R	Yes
8365	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Painter, Susan	Yes
8366	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heinemann, Heinz J	No
8367	5/7/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stiltner, Leo H	Yes
8368	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	R, J	No
8369	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Rutherford, Sarah	Yes
8370	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, Nature Conservancy	Stifler, John R	No
8371	5/7/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Your Dunes	RICE, KEVIN P	No
8372	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wyckoff, Eric	No
8373	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8374	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Lansing, Jim	Yes
8375	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kloefkorn, Walter	Yes
8376	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8377	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Roschke, Leah	Yes
8378	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Markley, Earl	Yes
8379	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		,	No
8380	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Williams, Donna	Yes
8381	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Franklin, Douglas	Yes
8382	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	DaVanzo, Joan	Yes
8383	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Douglass, Laurie F	Yes
8384	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Newman, Christopher	Yes
8385	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Tangney, John	No
8386	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hall-Bodie, Adrienne	Yes
8387	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Evans, Carol J	Yes
8388	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burr, Sidney	Yes
8389	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	hobson, kelvin	Yes
8390	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fresen, Alexandra	Yes
8391	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hunt, Jeffrey	Yes
8392	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barnhard, Meagan	Yes
8393	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miller, Judith	Yes
8394	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brown, Irene	Yes
8395	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ra, Orchid	Yes
8396	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilkens, Patricia	Yes
8397	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ryan, Joanne	Yes
8398	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garlena, Sharon	Yes

0008645

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8399	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Falbowski, Ellen M	No
8400	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Koon, Josh	Yes
8401	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Posey, Raphael	Yes
8402	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harris, Kelly	Yes
8403	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Crane, Kimberly	Yes
8404	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Loosemore, Richard P	Yes
8405	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	concerned citizen	Hansen, Barbara	No
8406	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Saenger, Elizabeth B	Yes
8407	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gibbons, Richard F	Yes
8408	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Bodywise Pilates Studio	Sidbury, Mercy	No
8409	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8410	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chilcote, Frances	Yes
8411	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Landau, John C	No
8412	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Foundation	N/A, N/A	Yes
8413	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sutton, Robert H	Yes
8414	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Logan, Ann	Yes
8415	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Donna	Yes
8416	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burton, Judith	Yes
8417	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Melnik, Littal	Yes
8418	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Albright, Amy	Yes
8419	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Allen, Resi	Yes
8420	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Arthur, Colleen	Yes
8421	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Masferrer, Santiago	Yes
8422	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kennedy, Heather	Yes
8423	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weikert, J	Yes
8424	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mandano, Marie	Yes
8425	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	S. Coe, Sally	Yes
8426	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Green, Dorie	Yes
8427	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Juracka, Robert	Yes
8428	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	king, carolyn	Yes
8429	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hunt, Otto J	No
8430	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8431	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	Beauchaine, Heike H	Yes
8432	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8433	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National parks Conservation Association	Macklin, Roger L	No
8434	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8435	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Little, Ryan D	Yes
8436	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peele, Donna L	No
8437	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8438	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ecker, Susan Margot	Yes
8439	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8440	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Conservation	Frank, Lee	Yes
8441	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Brooker, Eric G	Yes
8442	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hickey, Jane A	No
8443	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Neville, Paula L	No
8444	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	King, Gwendolyn	Yes
8445	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Eric	Yes
8446	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Costa, Demelza	No
8447	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Cassella, Susan F	Yes
8448	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cannatella, John	No
8449	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, N/A	Yes

0008646

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8450	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Randal G	Yes
8451	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Popiel, Ken j	No
8452	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8453	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Dahlgren, PhD, Mr. Shelley D	Yes
8454	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bolton, Benjamin C	Yes
8455	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Thorpe, Kristina	Yes
8456	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8457	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8458	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	PATC	Duncan, Marilyn	Yes
8459	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	SHINDELECKER, PAULA	Yes
8460	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	McDaniel, Mark	No
8461	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nieland, Tom	No
8462	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8463	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	D'Ottavio, Donna K	No
8464	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Schacht, Timothy A	Yes
8465	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leppla, Joan & Mike	No
8466	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, N/A	No
8467	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gingery, Suze W	Yes
8468	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Coalition of National Park Service Retirees and NPCA	Koepp, W. Philip	No
8469	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Deck, Robert T	No
8470	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8471	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8472	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bannister, Jesse D	Yes
8473	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Turner, Mike	Yes
8474	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cervenka, Nancy A	Yes
8475	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ratcliff, Philip J	No
8476	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Poss, Joan P	No
8477	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Graves, Caryn R	Yes
8478	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swan, Rita	No
8479	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Frantz, Warren and Janet	Yes
8480	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Futrell, Sherrill	No
8481	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Henderson, DeWitt	No
8482	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilde, Ronda	Yes
8483	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schaub, John P	No
8484	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Greathouse-Neel, Donna F	Yes
8485	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Jen	Yes
8486	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Youngs, Carol	Yes
8487	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Concord Township Historical Society	Squyres, Marianne D	Yes
8488	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Onasch, Otto F	No
8489	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Campbell, Andrew M	Yes
8490	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kirkland, Kathy	No
8491	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		pan, pinky jain	No
8492	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Katz, Donalee	No
8493	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Boyer, Mary T	No
8494	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8495	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bodwell, Jenny	Yes
8496	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lucchesi, Susan	Yes

0008647

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8497	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamilton, Jean P	No
8498	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Doner, Leslee	No
8499	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Genin, Merideth K	No
8500	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Haigh, Kristi	No
8501	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Amundson, Beret	No
8502	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	many	Burgen, Julia	Yes
8503	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Elliott, Shannon	No
8504	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rusk, Cornelia	No
8505	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hill, Robert D	No
8506	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dzindzeleta, Ramona	Yes
8507	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Emme, Tom	Yes
8508	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Petitpas, B	Yes
8509	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Multer, Karen	Yes
8510	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Sandra D	No
8511	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Follansbee, Mark	Yes
8512	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pham, John	Yes
8513	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Manning, James I	Yes
8514	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hartman, Carol	Yes
8515	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	van den blink, kieren n	Yes
8516	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		P, U	Yes
8517	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stowers, Carol W	Yes
8518	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		George, William	Yes
8519	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	New York City Streetsingers	Harman, Rosalie R	Yes
8520	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	member	braly, laura	Yes
8521	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bolton, Nancy s	Yes
8522	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Watson, Don L	Yes
8523	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor Jr, S Fred	No
8524	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gooch, Watson P	Yes
8525	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bloch, Charles	No
8526	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Traub, Don C	Yes
8527	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sheridan, Marlene	Yes
8528	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Basilone, Joe	No
8529	5/7/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hopkins, Paul C	Yes
8530	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schymanski, Karen	No
8531	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Snyder, William L	Yes
8532	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fogarty, Dan/Paula	No
8533	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc	OMeara Dietrich, Chris	Yes
8534	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ostgaard, Wendy	No
8535	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		whalen, shirley m	No
8536	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kinsey, Graeme	No
8537	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8538	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Grubler, Matthew S	Yes
8539	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Franchitto, Dana L	No
8540	4/29/2010	No	Business	Global Surf Network	Beedie, Rob	No
8541	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, James D	No
8542	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Garnant, Gregory	No
8543	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Raider, Philip W	Yes
8544	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Giencke, Jill	Yes
8545	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	ACLU	McDougal, Sarah h	Yes
8546	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	McCreary, Jan C	No
8547	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walberg, George	No
8548	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dorshkind, Larry	No
8549	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8550	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Sean	No
8551	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Overman, Sue A	No
8552	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		wang, ruby	No
8553	4/29/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Virginia Coastal Access Now (VCAN)	Feltner, Mark	No
8554	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Zeilenga, Jack	No
8555	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Mr and Mrs James	No
8556	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McCartin, Mike W	No
8557	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		moulin, mark	Yes
8558	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8559	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Martha	Yes
8560	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, William J	No
8561	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Coutant, Howard	Yes
8562	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Worzel, Howard	Yes
8563	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gross, Gary	No
8564	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sokol, Marianna	Yes
8565	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	None	Hillberg, Mary	Yes
8566	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8567	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hopkins, Kathleen	Yes
8568	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		sickafoose, jim	Yes
8569	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kopeck, Patricia	No
8570	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wolstenholme, Daniel E	Yes
8571	5/7/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pitt, Virginia M	Yes
8572	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	McMillion, Laura A	Yes
8573	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Aronson, Sylvia A	No
8574	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8575	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8576	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Johnson, Elaine	No
8577	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crane, Bill	Yes
8578	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooper, Ken	No
8579	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lam, Julie	No
8580	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Watts, Elizabeth	No
8581	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nature Conservancy	Ryan, George E	No
8582	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Seagraves, Margaret	Yes
8583	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lamke, Richard	Yes
8584	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hatch Carlsen, Gillian	Yes
8585	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thornton, Ann	Yes
8586	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	DeMalio, Tony	Yes
8587	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bradshaw, John	Yes
8588	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Farris, Mathew	Yes
8589	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ramsey, Emma	Yes
8590	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Anderson, Jackie	Yes
8591	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Patch, Laura	Yes
8592	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Diaz, Marta	Yes
8593	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Loudermilk, Brooke	Yes
8594	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crabill, Phillip J	No
8595	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Patrick, Danielle	Yes
8596	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bryant, Ron and Nancy	Yes
8597	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Herren, Ann	Yes
8598	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	DiPalma, Austen	Yes
8599	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bellflower, Shannon	Yes
8600	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miller, Paul	Yes
8601	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dooley, Tracy	Yes
8602	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kastern, William	Yes
8603	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zaccagnino, Ellen	Yes

0008649

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8604	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Israel, Nellie I	Yes
8605	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wissel, Meredith	Yes
8606	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gordon, Marvene A	No
8607	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Donnell, Ellen H	Yes
8608	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Newman, Connie A	Yes
8609	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Krakow, Jessica	No
8610	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Blessing, Bill	No
8611	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Koehl, Lisa	Yes
8612	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Andes, John W	Yes
8613	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	None	Miller, Marilyn	No
8614	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hunsberger, Barbara	No
8615	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Watson, Jennifer L	No
8616	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smallman, Jennylee	Yes
8617	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dikinis, Claudia	Yes
8618	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stuart, Wendy	Yes
8619	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scheiman, Daniel	Yes
8620	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gariepy, Paulette	Yes
8621	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Conroy, Richard	Yes
8622	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hirsch, Kathy	Yes
8623	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	seawel, carly	Yes
8624	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hostnik, Mary Jo	Yes
8625	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	morris, alex	Yes
8626	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	dunn, kathleen	Yes
8627	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Currie, James	Yes
8628	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Liang, Alicia	Yes
8629	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	arvola, andarin	Yes
8630	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jurczweski, Carol	Yes
8631	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garrison, Wendy	Yes
8632	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edwards, Karen	Yes
8633	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kolehmainen, Rich & Linda	Yes
8634	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scheppe, William	Yes
8635	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8636	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hicks, Robert	Yes
8637	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	SFWA	Lackey, Mercedes R	Yes
8638	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8639	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Van Dale, Monna G	Yes
8640	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cloud, Thomas K	Yes
8641	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8642	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Getty, Ann	No
8643	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davison, Amber S	No
8644	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Daniels, Bryant R	Yes
8645	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DeMars, Louis R	Yes
8646	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bolomey, Kristen E	Yes
8647	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barthel, Leora W	Yes
8648	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stallone, Frank	Yes
8649	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kreuter, Q.	No
8650	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Anderson, Carol W	No
8651	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Denney, David	No
8652	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8653	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ahumada, Leo	No
8654	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lavrin, Andrew	Yes
8655	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Miani, Nicole	Yes
8656	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Anderson, Judith S	Yes

0008650

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8657	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Livesay, Corinne B	No
8658	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8659	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Individual Activist	Chipman, Eric H	No
8660	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Suter, Ann C	Yes
8661	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Guttenberg, Marta	No
8662	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pearce , J B	No
8663	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Arnold, Frank J	Yes
8664	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wheeler, Nelle D	Yes
8665	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Caitlin	No
8666	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Low, Sammy	No
8667	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Sloneker, Sam	Yes
8668	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bedell, David	No
8669	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Mo, Lisa	Yes
8670	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8671	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8672	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rainey, Dorli	No
8673	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Jeff	Yes
8674	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		porter, ted	Yes
8675	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	retired	wilson, donald b	Yes
8676	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rubio, Mike	No
8677	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Donohew, Kenyon E	Yes
8678	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Self	Andrews, Frank G	Yes
8679	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Parrish, Roberta L	Yes
8680	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ellis, Dale H	No
8681	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, Michael A	Yes
8682	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	national park service	wisner, jerry w	Yes
8683	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Geoffrey	No
8684	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8685	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Audubon Society	Davlantes, Nancy	Yes
8686	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	n/a	Kampwirth, Gregory P	Yes
8687	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dittman, David N	Yes
8688	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mostov, Elizabeth	Yes
8689	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Great Old Broads for Wilderness and Center for Biological Diversity	Millet, Saralaine	No
8690	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hasbun, Elizabeth	Yes
8691	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Griffin, James V	No
8692	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8693	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8694	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lamb, Alexandra	Yes
8695	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Basnar, Lee	No
8696	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Holmes, Jay	Yes
8697	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Power, Alicia A	Yes
8698	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Scheller, Emil	Yes
8699	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		George, Marvin I	No
8700	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Meek, Laura A	Yes
8701	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Knotts, Timothy A	No
8702	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8703	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beringer, Ted M	No
8704	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cowin, Caryn L	Yes
8705	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cicerchi, Kathryn R	Yes
8706	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chadwick, K.Jordan	Yes
8707	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	Mutch, Mary L	Yes
8708	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Loughmiller, Karen H.	No

0008651

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8709	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Amer. Assn Univ, Wimen	Sellers, Shirley N	Yes
8710	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8711	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Klosterman, Jeff A	No
8712	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Pierce College	Narkevicius, Lupita	Yes
8713	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Berryhill, Jr., William I	No
8714	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dahn, Rick D	No
8715	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		mcgee, aaron m	Yes
8716	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McKenna, Colleen	No
8717	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Goebel, Fred J	Yes
8718	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Preserve Beach Access	Kathleen, Burch G	Yes
8719	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goode, Michael	Yes
8720	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	VanderLaan, Harold R	Yes
8721	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Russ + Judy	No
8722	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8723	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8724	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Demro, Rebecca	No
8725	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8726	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8727	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McCulloch, Jim	No
8728	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ford, Michael C	No
8729	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kozak, cathy	Yes
8730	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hodie, Mark	Yes
8731	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jackson, Bruce	Yes
8732	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8733	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	East End	Collings, Dustin S	Yes
8734	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Herndon, Laura	No
8735	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8736	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8737	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Stahl, Charlotte	No
8738	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Estes, Katherine F	Yes
8739	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Unites States	Benford, Al	No
8740	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	moiseyev, maya	Yes
8741	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Barbara	No
8742	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Griffin, John	No
8743	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kiver, Eugene	No
8744	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Giese, Mark M	No
8745	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Owens, Stephanie	No
8746	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Koenig, Suzanne	Yes
8747	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vactor, Kathy T	Yes
8748	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		St. Clir, Ann	Yes
8749	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Jarvis, Richard	Yes
8750	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCS	Eggleston, David	Yes
8751	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Meyers, Ed	Yes
8752	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ross, Diana M	Yes
8753	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8754	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		unknown, unknown	No
8755	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Haynes, Bill L	Yes
8756	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Latamore, George B	No
8757	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Jones, Emily A	No
8758	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8759	5/7/2010	No	Business	Puel's Chihuahuas	Puel, Gloria J	No
8760	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Carney, Marilyn	Yes
8761	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Magori, Krisztian	No
8762	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Pitt, Tom W	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8763	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8764	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, Philip W	No
8765	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blevins, Terry	No
8766	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8767	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schpok, Irwin L	Yes
8768	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Stevens, Lisa	No
8769	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCully, Kodie L	Yes
8770	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stephens, Paul E	No
8771	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	PEPC	Horner, Julie	Yes
8772	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Camacho, C	Yes
8773	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Margolese-Malin, Rebecca	Yes
8774	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schnellenberger, Robyn	Yes
8775	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zeng, Miyako	Yes
8776	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shpino, Katya	Yes
8777	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Blanchette, John	Yes
8778	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fuski, Philip	Yes
8779	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schafer, Deb	Yes
8780	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Herbst, Ruth	Yes
8781	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rodman, Shirley	Yes
8782	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McCleary, Jane	Yes
8783	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Donohue, M	No
8784	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lewis, Lisa	Yes
8785	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Manard, Michael	Yes
8786	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hepp, Susana	Yes
8787	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ruskin, Lorie C	Yes
8788	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lane, Thomas	Yes
8789	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cotton, Kimberly	Yes
8790	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Trevallion, Tia	Yes
8791	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lloyd, Susan	Yes
8792	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gluckman, Geoffrey	Yes
8793	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Burns, Cecilia A	Yes
8794	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Allen, Jan	Yes
8795	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Faller, Lisa	Yes
8796	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scanlin, Sue	Yes
8797	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clement, Rochele	Yes
8798	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Genis, Mia	Yes
8799	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Donahue, Lynne	Yes
8800	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Strivelli, Rachel	Yes
8801	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Finch Jr, Ronald	Yes
8802	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Thomas	Yes
8803	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Loiselle, David	Yes
8804	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		thorp, charles	No
8805	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Matriscino, Patrick F	No
8806	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8807	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gladstone, David	No
8808	4/30/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Finley, Margaret and George	No
8809	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Mittelstaedt, Douglas	Yes
8810	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8811	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Stedman, Deborah	No
8812	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		sullivan, linda	No
8813	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Valdez, Anne	No
8814	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Girolami, Martha	Yes

0008653

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8815	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Babore, Jill	Yes
8816	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, John	No
8817	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Campion, E.J.	Yes
8818	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Jeffrey, James D	No
8819	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Jacqueline	Yes
8820	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hertzfel, David E	No
8821	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gassman, Jay	Yes
8822	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cosgriff, PE, Mark	Yes
8823	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bostick, Amy	Yes
8824	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kleinbach, Mary	Yes
8825	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNeill, Amanda	Yes
8826	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McFarlane, Cerissa	Yes
8827	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Brennan, Robert E	No
8828	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bennett, Matthew	Yes
8829	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Unruh, Angie	Yes
8830	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lowenstine, Linda	Yes
8831	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	boeck, courtney	Yes
8832	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		unknown, unknown	No
8833	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Mittelstaedt, Douglas	Yes
8834	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Saunders, Jamie	Yes
8835	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peele, Donna L	No
8836	5/7/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8837	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lawrence, Susan	No
8838	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stein, Carl	Yes
8839	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Osinski, Ashley S	Yes
8840	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kelvington, James R	No
8841	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kitchens, Allegra	No
8842	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bell, Linda A	No
8843	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Virginia Association for Parks	Finch, President, Johnny	No
8844	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Keller, Robert	No
8845	5/3/2010	No	Business	Natural Art Surf Shop	Busbey, Carol	No
8846	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	HSUS	RAEHL, MARY	No
8847	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hubert, Karl F	Yes
8848	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Smith, Kathy	No
8849	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Maine People's Alliance	Bernard, John	Yes
8850	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, W. N	No
8851	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8852	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8853	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Finley, Margaret and George	No
8854	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kumar, Chetan	Yes
8855	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sorensen, Jerry	Yes
8856	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dillenberger, Joyce	No
8857	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	The Noodle Shop	Hetz, Michael H	No
8858	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Selquist, Donna J	No
8859	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jhangiani, Anka	No
8860	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heilig, Lovie	No
8861	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wallace, Amy L	Yes
8862	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Shafransky, Paula	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8863	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hicks, Robert A	No
8864	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8865	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Belton, Dick	No
8866	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Conroy, Thomas R.	No
8867	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wacker, Heidi	Yes
8868	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kurland, miriam	No
8869	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		serafin, Kiara m	Yes
8870	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Neuhauser, Alice	No
8871	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		stonebraker, bob	Yes
8872	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Todd-Dennis, Patricia	No
8873	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Daniels, Geneva N	Yes
8874	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8875	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cohen, Mary Ann	No
8876	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Devine, Don J	Yes
8877	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lobel, Colleen P	Yes
8878	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Godwin, Barry L	Yes
8879	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Daniel	Yes
8880	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8881	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Marshland, Susanna S	Yes
8882	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Compton, Carole M	No
8883	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamp-Lane, Sandra	Yes
8884	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gould, Jr., Burnham S	No
8885	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Deacy, Bob	Yes
8886	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Massey, Mary E	Yes
8887	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Shogren, Gary S	No
8888	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nash, Jonathan	No
8889	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McDevitt, Dana L	Yes
8890	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	IRC	CLOUD, DON E	No
8891	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Karaczun, Alex	No
8892	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wright, Margo A	No
8893	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	PEPC	Fahy, Diana E	No
8894	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Speas, Clinton R	Yes
8895	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	US Citizen	Snowden, Patricia S	No
8896	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jason, Carol A	Yes
8897	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	BTCA	Berkshire, David C	No
8898	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Steininger, Robert	No
8899	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8900	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gerbitz, Gordon	Yes
8901	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bates, Kim	No
8902	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bodeman, Ruth A	No
8903	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Velsmid, Stephanie	No
8904	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vance, Ron	No
8905	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Maryanski, Joe	No
8906	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leon, Mary A	No
8907	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Benfield, Knolan	No
8908	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Band, David	No
8909	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schadow, Karen	Yes
8910	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lander, Traci	No
8911	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA, Friends of Acadia	Bromage, Joan H	Yes
8912	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8913	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Farmer, Michael	Yes
8914	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Karen	Yes
8915	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mudrick, Stephen E	Yes
8916	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hanson, Nancy A	No
8917	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8918	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freese, Lisanne	No

0008655

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8919	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Suter, Jamison D	Yes
8920	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Harriman, Frances	Yes
8921	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Beard, Lara	No
8922	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		De Robbio, Elisabetta	No
8923	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mullen, Timothy I	No
8924	5/7/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Randall, Mike D	Yes
8925	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Zolezzi, Deidra	Yes
8926	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reid, Ryan	Yes
8927	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Marilyn	No
8928	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Human race	Hanify, Tim	No
8929	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	DAPONTE, DR. KENNETH	Yes
8930	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tellinghuisen, Joel	No
8931	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Jansen, Kimberly K	No
8932	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Environmental Priorities Network	Light, Lillian K	No
8933	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Buckner, Carolyn M	No
8934	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Overholt, Roger	Yes
8935	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Homernik, Sharon A	Yes
8936	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schmid, George A	No
8937	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8938	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Engler, Pamela M	No
8939	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Kate	Yes
8940	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Adrian D	No
8941	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mills, Rebecca	Yes
8942	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Academy of Sciences	Bennett, Michael V	No
8943	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	national park association	N/A, N/A	Yes
8944	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sheridan, Gabriel T	No
8945	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swisher, Bill	Yes
8946	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chenkin, Cari	Yes
8947	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hansen, Mike	No
8948	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc	Cavaluchi, Robert	Yes
8949	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	national parks conservation association	Robinson, Jennifer L	No
8950	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Wilderness Society	Walters, Jim	No
8951	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Conservation Assoc	Mineo, Alan	No
8952	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
8953	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barr, Laura	Yes
8954	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	N, Elise	Yes
8955	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Morton, Eleanor	Yes
8956	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		smith, randal	Yes
8957	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	BOISSONNAULT, JAMES	Yes
8958	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sigmon, Lora	Yes
8959	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zellman, Sharon	Yes
8960	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	BAKER, DEBBY	Yes
8961	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Meckelnburg, Karen	Yes
8962	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Long, Steven	Yes
8963	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sigmon, Billie	Yes
8964	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Martin, Sara	Yes
8965	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Assoc	Nolte, Sharon	Yes
8966	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Charles	Yes
8967	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tracy, Diane	Yes
8968	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	del Giudice, Teresa	Yes
8969	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Powelson, Jocelyn	Yes

0008656

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
8970	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wade, Jane	Yes
8971	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bandmd, David	Yes
8972	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Jo	Yes
8973	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carlisle, Cynthia	Yes
8974	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wetherell, Ashley	Yes
8975	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hartig, Frank	Yes
8976	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shepard, William	Yes
8977	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barshay, Helen	Yes
8978	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lynch, Marguerite A	No
8979	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	sampson, joan	No
8980	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Aubrey-Garrett, Karen F	Yes
8981	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8982	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		jhangiani, arjan k	No
8983	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hughes, Angie	Yes
8984	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aird, Bruce	Yes
8985	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harrigal, Judy	Yes
8986	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bonometti, Bobby & Ginny	Yes
8987	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Comas, Maria	Yes
8988	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	E, Georgia	Yes
8989	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ratcliff, Rebecca A	No
8990	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Organization	Bryant, Pamela R	Yes
8991	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Edwards, Eric	No
8992	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Scott	Yes
8993	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lieb, Thomas	Yes
8994	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adkins, Marianne	Yes
8995	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bialkowski, Valerie	Yes
8996	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Somers, Ami	Yes
8997	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wagner, Bonnie	Yes
8998	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
8999	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Craine, Shirley	Yes
9000	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Webber, Patricia	Yes
9001	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reback, Mark	Yes
9002	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Block, Trent	Yes
9003	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Malmberg, Greg B	No
9004	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCS	Murphy, Aileen M	Yes
9005	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Giles, Al	No
9006	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Presnell, Andrew H	Yes
9007	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Floyd, Stacy	No
9008	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9009	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	national parks conservation	wilson, martha	Yes
9010	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9011	5/7/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Setaro, Michelle	No
9012	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wynne, Diane	No
9013	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mullin, Anne E	No
9014	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reiter, Marcia E	No
9015	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Savett, Adam	No
9016	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9017	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	human race	Carnein, Carl R	No
9018	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		mulder, joel d	No
9019	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Raymond, Michael R	No
9020	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ROGERS, JULIE A	Yes
9021	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Greer, L	Yes
9022	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wald, Aloysius J	No

0008657

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9023	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9024	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9025	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bradley, DJ	No
9026	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Poten, cynthia E	No
9027	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Agua Fria Open Space Alliance, Inc.	Johnson, N/A	No
9028	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Connors, Jennifer B	Yes
9029	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	RSCJ	Fox, Eleanor	No
9030	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Seltzer, Rob	No
9031	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lee, Ginny R	Yes
9032	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		List, Andrew W	Yes
9033	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tidwell, Stephanie P	No
9034	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9035	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wood, Peter	Yes
9036	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mattes, Martha A	Yes
9037	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kurtz, Nancy B	No
9038	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon Association	Winkler, Linda	Yes
9039	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tedeschi, Julie & Ron	Yes
9040	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9041	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Malone, Beth	Yes
9042	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9043	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, John M	No
9044	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DellaLoggia, Denis	No
9045	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Scherwin, John C	No
9046	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Templin, John L	Yes
9047	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9048	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dent, Christopher A	No
9049	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9050	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Epstein, Kelly E	No
9051	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Baker, Paul	No
9052	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Epstein, Kelly E	No
9053	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nerwick, Randall M	No
9054	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9055	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9056	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Little, Andrea	No
9057	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9058	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		krause, karen	No
9059	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	N P C A	Carringer, Nancy	Yes
9060	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Garcia-Barrio, Constance	No
9061	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Van Aken, Richard S	Yes
9062	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dennis, Edwin L	Yes
9063	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stillman, Lynn	Yes
9064	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Meacham, Thomas S	No
9065	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Roy, Joe	No
9066	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Donovan, Phyllis	No
9067	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	moses, connie p	Yes
9068	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sinacore, Paul	No
9069	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9070	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Buttles, Kathryn M	Yes
9071	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9072	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9073	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		seabrook, kathy l	Yes
9074	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Fissinger, Julie C	No
9075	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Brown, O. D	Yes

0008658

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9076	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Garitty, Michael	Yes
9077	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Self	Hooson, Clare	No
9078	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Ventura County Republicans	Robinson, Craig N	Yes
9079	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Buffalo Trace Humane Society	Manning, Mary F	No
9080	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		rickenbach, deborah j	Yes
9081	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Oxford Inland Wetlands Commission	Adamski, Thomas	No
9082	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reese, Toby	No
9083	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Haug, Catherine	Yes
9084	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hubbard, Mary	Yes
9085	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		horton, chris	Yes
9086	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Radcliff, Ruth-Ann	Yes
9087	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Linhoff, Jenny	Yes
9088	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		White, Judith F	No
9089	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bartels, John	No
9090	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Little, Irene R	No
9091	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Wolfe, Melanie	Yes
9092	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cosgrove, John C	No
9093	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Armer, Joan	Yes
9094	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Groves, Ronald	No
9095	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	United States of America	Mitchell, Charles S	No
9096	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lohr, J.	Yes
9097	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		,	No
9098	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9099	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Connors, Jen	Yes
9100	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barber, Frances	Yes
9101	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O' Connor, Denise	Yes
9102	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Trufan, Hal	Yes
9103	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Knight, Jo Ann	Yes
9104	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hannaford, Paul	Yes
9105	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Amalphy, Madeline	Yes
9106	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Marquis, Amy	Yes
9107	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc	Derbigny, Rodney J	No
9108	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Portman, Wendy	Yes
9109	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hester Dawes, Karen	Yes
9110	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	DiPerna, Lauren	Yes
9111	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Labine, Darlene	Yes
9112	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Taylor, Deniseann	Yes
9113	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Mary	Yes
9114	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lawrence, Julie	Yes
9115	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fergusson, Julie	Yes
9116	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Antkoviak, Deborah	Yes
9117	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, catherine	Yes
9118	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		wajda, Scott P	No
9119	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	zegledi, dawn	Yes
9120	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O, Mindy	Yes
9121	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mathias, Beverly	No
9122	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gutkowski, Marie	Yes
9123	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		goto, matthew a	Yes
9124	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Jacqueline	Yes
9125	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Connors, Jen	Yes
9126	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Christofferson, Carol	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9127	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murray, Judy	Yes
9128	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finkleiner, John & Dee	Yes
9129	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Winkler, Linda	Yes
9130	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kramer, Susan	Yes
9131	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wade, Warren F.	Yes
9132	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fish, Beth	Yes
9133	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, pamela	Yes
9134	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	GFWC	McDermott, Ann	Yes
9135	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marine, Edward	Yes
9136	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marsh, David	Yes
9137	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pinckard, David	Yes
9138	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beaudoin, Elizabeth	Yes
9139	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Baxter, Joslyn	Yes
9140	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blust, Barry	Yes
9141	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chaiken, Mara	Yes
9142	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lohr, R.	Yes
9143	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Glenn C	No
9144	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		PLATT, KEN	No
9145	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9146	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Conservation Ass.	Best, Bobbie D	No
9147	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9148	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fedorov, Kristina	No
9149	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fusco, Carol A	Yes
9150	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bartell, Frank	No
9151	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jimenez, Adriana	Yes
9152	5/7/2010	No	Business	Parson's Garden	Carlson, Parson	No
9153	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9154	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bihari, Michele	Yes
9155	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, J	No
9156	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Aikens, Sonja L	No
9157	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9158	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Marks, Loretta	Yes
9159	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Frey, Lisa J	No
9160	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ellis, Catherine	Yes
9161	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nidess, M.D., Rael	Yes
9162	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9163	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dimen, Michael	No
9164	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		maisey, catherine	No
9165	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Orr, Joe	No
9166	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Younger, Nancy M	No
9167	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9168	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Gaines, David	No
9169	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Daletski, Anne	No
9170	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bernard, Janice	No
9171	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hickman, Tammy	No
9172	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9173	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Every, Sofia	No
9174	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9175	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat. Parks Cons. Assn.	McCarthy, James	Yes
9176	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Nelson, George	Yes
9177	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9178	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Raymond, Judith A	No
9179	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Meeker, Bernice	Yes
9180	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Saldana, Shannon	No
9181	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Dew, Aloma W	No

0008660

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9182	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	None	Merz, William R	Yes
9183	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Miller, Toby	No
9184	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Conservation Committe of Baltimore Bird Club	N/A, N/A	Yes
9185	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Watson, Chris E	Yes
9186	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cato, Mary E	No
9187	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kasdan, Maxann M	No
9188	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Winkler, Daniel S	Yes
9189	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dawson, Julie A	Yes
9190	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		long, ronald	Yes
9191	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Phillips, Chip	No
9192	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brady, Kevin	No
9193	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McFadden, Mary L	Yes
9194	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Burke, Elizabeth	Yes
9195	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crandall, Lynn	Yes
9196	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zalewski, Steve	Yes
9197	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Adornato III, John	No
9198	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Lodge, Sheila	Yes
9199	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9200	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9201	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Neff, Jeffrey A	No
9202	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9203	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Berteaux, Elizabeth	Yes
9204	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		rosenblood, jamie	Yes
9205	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chandler, Leonard B	No
9206	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Onuf, Kristin	Yes
9207	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Guest, Sarah	Yes
9208	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Faust, Malcolm & Carol	Yes
9209	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burwinkel, Mark J	Yes
9210	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cummings, Paula	Yes
9211	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Redmond, Jill	Yes
9212	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Price, LeAnn	Yes
9213	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thomas, Theresa	Yes
9214	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rickenbach, Deborah	Yes
9215	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ziccardi, Christian	Yes
9216	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hinze, Willie	Yes
9217	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Durham, Donna	Yes
9218	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nathan, S. Ranga	Yes
9219	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Westgate, Jennifer	Yes
9220	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dobrzynski, Robert	Yes
9221	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tyndall, Marie	Yes
9222	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Remington, Cheryl	Yes
9223	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zell, Karen	Yes
9224	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clem, Sherry	Yes
9225	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Windsor, Andrew	Yes
9226	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Benson, Elaine	Yes
9227	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pressman, Emily	Yes
9228	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ward, Gail	Yes
9229	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Eden, Erica	Yes
9230	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Forbes, William	No
9231	5/7/2010	No	Business	Xac Consulting	fisher, john	No
9232	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bruce, Donald E	No
9233	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Couch, Sandra L	No

0008661

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9234	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Francine	Yes
9235	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harkins, Joanne E	Yes
9236	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Baley, Patricia M	No
9237	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goodrich, D'Arcy	Yes
9238	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Clint	Yes
9239	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dohearty, Tom	No
9240	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	Hodge, Tonya M	Yes
9241	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bakke, Susan	No
9242	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9243	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lynton, Ronken	Yes
9244	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCleary, Harriet C	Yes
9245	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Milliren, Patricia	Yes
9246	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boswell, Thomas	Yes
9247	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Speck, Sharon	Yes
9248	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Appell, Stephen	Yes
9249	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Gillian	Yes
9250	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoodwin, Marcia	Yes
9251	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schroer, Richard	Yes
9252	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lopez, Patricia	Yes
9253	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dragon, Catherine	Yes
9254	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Luehrmann, Paul	Yes
9255	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ries, James	Yes
9256	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hughes, Connie	Yes
9257	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NRDC, National Parks Conservation Organization, Earth Justice, Sierra Club	DEMCHUCK, LAURA	Yes
9258	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hayn, Claude	Yes
9259	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Linarez , KJ	No
9260	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rosenkotter, Barbara	No
9261	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Roper, A	Yes
9262	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Bramblett, Sharon	Yes
9263	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Merrill, Lawrence O	No
9264	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Harkins, J	Yes
9265	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9266	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McIntire, Shirl	Yes
9267	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Nelson, Malcolm	Yes
9268	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9269	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	educator	vogler, robin I	No
9270	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Palladine, Michelle	Yes
9271	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	Leonard, Richard L	No
9272	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9273	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		leitch, mary	No
9274	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9275	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Williamson, Jane	Yes
9276	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sikes, III, Oscar J	Yes
9277	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Telgarsky, Kim	No
9278	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Petsitis, Jamie	No
9279	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Collins, Ann J	No
9280	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club/Group Conservation Chair	Voitik, Terri E	No
9281	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wisch, Christine	Yes
9282	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, Valeria M	Yes
9283	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		de Vincent, Lisa	Yes
9284	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Skinner, Russell	No
9285	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zalewski, Nancy L	Yes

0008662

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9286	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	wwf	johnson, I a	Yes
9287	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	DAnna, Marie	No
9288	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bustos, Andrea E	Yes
9289	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hooton, Robert	Yes
9290	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, James H	No
9291	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Roether, Richard	No
9292	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ausura, Robert V	No
9293	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Beavers, Nancy H	Yes
9294	5/7/2010	Potential (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Marshall, Sally	Yes
9295	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	error	nieters, lenore i	Yes
9296	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc.	Stone, Maria R	No
9297	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fourman, Mrs. Marlin	No
9298	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Reichard, Tim	Yes
9299	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Haney, Sid L	No
9300	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	desc	scalzo, geno j	Yes
9301	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Frink, Timothy	Yes
9302	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bosma, Tyler	No
9303	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9304	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9305	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Edwards, Pamela C	Yes
9306	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks & Conservation	Walzer, Edward P	No
9307	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9308	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hart, Nancy G	No
9309	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cox, Millicent	No
9310	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9311	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wigand, Sunni	No
9312	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eckert, Hugh	No
9313	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ehmke, Forrest	Yes
9314	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Colicino, Jr., Thomas C	Yes
9315	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		hegegan, elizabeth	Yes
9316	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Blackeagle, Cory	No
9317	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Collins, Carol L	No
9318	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Batty, Vernon	Yes
9319	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kessler, Nancy S	Yes
9320	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Goller, Leslie A	No
9321	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Landeo, Eva	No
9322	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		abrams, sally	Yes
9323	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		goldman, steven	No
9324	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		stocker, michael	Yes
9325	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Bailey, Therold E	No
9326	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stanks, Tom J	Yes
9327	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Padgett, Judith K	No
9328	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Canada, Eugenna A	Yes
9329	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Duerr, Donna	Yes
9330	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sliptchuk, Claire	No
9331	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Manning, Laura	Yes
9332	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9333	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnett, Brittany H	No
9334	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bolman, Diane	No
9335	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Singer, Sue	Yes

0008663

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9336	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cohen, Andrew M	No
9337	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Oklahoma Native Plant Society	Cox, Chadwick	No
9338	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9339	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gillespie, Ellie	Yes
9340	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whitlock, Anita	Yes
9341	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Waterworth, Sarah	Yes
9342	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Watters, Christa	Yes
9343	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cartonia, Monika	Yes
9344	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cassada Jr, Lawrence	Yes
9345	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hodge, Tonya	Yes
9346	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Cris	Yes
9347	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wahl, Gina	Yes
9348	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	zegledi, sandra	Yes
9349	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Webb, Jody	Yes
9350	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Maimon, Sharon	Yes
9351	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lowery, Tiarra	Yes
9352	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coleman, Edith	Yes
9353	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gillanders, David	No
9354	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Black, Sandra	Yes
9355	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Davis, Becky	Yes
9356	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nielsen, Lessli	Yes
9357	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9358	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dynes, Elaine	Yes
9359	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Taylor, Michael	Yes
9360	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Carl	Yes
9361	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Damos, Betsy	Yes
9362	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Polanski, Joe	Yes
9363	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kunze, Jennifer	Yes
9364	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Simpson, Kylie	Yes
9365	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Strawbridge, Patricia	Yes
9366	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Salamon, Linda K	No
9367	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Katharine L	No
9368	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	npca	trent, bryan	Yes
9369	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Winfrey, Sheila K	Yes
9370	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dalal, Namita	Yes
9371	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamson, Ned	Yes
9372	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		poole, emma p	Yes
9373	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bossone, Lynn	Yes
9374	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	young, sandra	Yes
9375	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gooley, Betty Jo	Yes
9376	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	surges, dawn	Yes
9377	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bruny, Nancy	Yes
9378	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wepner, Sarita	Yes
9379	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Parra, Mery	Yes
9380	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hidalgo, Orlando	Yes
9381	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lyons, steve	Yes
9382	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Scott	Yes
9383	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zimmerman, Ben	Yes
9384	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pann, Robert	Yes
9385	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keegan, Mark	Yes
9386	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mobeck, Melissa	Yes
9387	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Korso, Marlene	Yes
9388	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Saunders, Marilyn	No
9389	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		SHEPLEY, ken	Yes
9390	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Forman, Maurice E	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9391	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nordgren, Ronald	No
9392	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9393	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Boone, Linda A	No
9394	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, victor	Yes
9395	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Lockwood, Mary L	No
9396	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kurman, Michael D	Yes
9397	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Borowiak, Natasha	No
9398	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation	Wallace, Donald W	Yes
9399	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9400	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NSP	Iemert, Elizabeth s	Yes
9401	5/7/2010	Potential (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ochmanek, E. J	No
9402	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9403	5/7/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	sustainability project	euston, stanley	No
9404	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9405	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Haresign, Andrea L	No
9406	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stephen, Ashley R	Yes
9407	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		GRIMES, HENRY	No
9408	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, V R	Yes
9409	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NWF, SPCA, PETA	Lacey, Sharon L	No
9410	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9411	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		English, William	No
9412	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Behrens, Joanna	Yes
9413	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, N/A	Yes
9414	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Goodwin, Bradford N	Yes
9415	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9416	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Sharen	No
9417	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Herrera, Laura	Yes
9418	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	HRWC	wells, michael a	No
9419	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	member	bishop, carolyn	Yes
9420	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bennett, LeeAnn	Yes
9421	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Vragel, James D	No
9422	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sevigny, Marie T	Yes
9423	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9424	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat. Parks Conservation assoc.	N/A, N/A	No
9425	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gesell, Judith A	No
9426	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9427	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Norcross, Christopher C	Yes
9428	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nothdurft, Anja B	Yes
9429	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Megay, Gina A	No
9430	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Martinoff, Kathy M	Yes
9431	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Trivisonno, Susan	No
9432	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	Willoughby, Emily A	No
9433	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Cecilia	Yes
9434	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kyle, Edgar M	No
9435	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9436	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kosec, Dawn	Yes
9437	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, William A	Yes
9438	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Pries, Catherine L	No
9439	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Dolins, Francine L	Yes
9440	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Craig, Julianne	No

0008665

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9441	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Decker, Corliss	Yes
9442	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, roy	No
9443	5/7/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sears, Julie C	No
9444	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Craig, Edward P	No
9445	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Sells, Greg	No
9446	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Foran, Carolyn O	Yes
9447	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Oleson, Pamela B	Yes
9448	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservancy	Patch, Bradford	No
9449	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gaguine, John	No
9450	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	constituent	Graham, Guy	Yes
9451	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assn	Fisher, Harold H	No
9452	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Blair, Dan and Janet W	Yes
9453	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Blackeagle, Cory	Yes
9454	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Snow, Sharon	Yes
9455	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ashley, Nic	Yes
9456	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wickersham, K	Yes
9457	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wheeler, Carrie	Yes
9458	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chartove, Julia	Yes
9459	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hurschik, Kimberly	Yes
9460	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Birnbaum, Hannah	Yes
9461	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Case, Dawn	Yes
9462	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bundara, T.	Yes
9463	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Macluskie, Robert	Yes
9464	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Curro, Stephen	Yes
9465	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Greenley, Deborah	Yes
9466	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Campbell, Connie	Yes
9467	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Eanes, Sue	Yes
9468	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Elleman, Tina	Yes
9469	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harland, Donald	Yes
9470	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Betters, Kathleen	Yes
9471	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Roberson, Mary	Yes
9472	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bowman, Gerald	Yes
9473	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fowler, Rachel	Yes
9474	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Wildlife Federation	Pendleton, Gary M	No
9475	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	puhek, glenda	Yes
9476	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Roach, Edward	Yes
9477	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9478	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nickles, Patricia	Yes
9479	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Julie	Yes
9480	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hickman, J. Milton	Yes
9481	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dennis, Theresa	Yes
9482	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Eads, Claudia	No
9483	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	League of Conservation Voters	Finder-Stone, RN, MS, Patricia A	No
9484	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Henderson, Doris	No
9485	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Taylor, James B	No
9486	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		tomlinson, paul	No
9487	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Bullock, George V	No
9488	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Alexander, J.	Yes
9489	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9490	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Conservation Association	Swenson, Craig S	Yes
9491	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Green Party	Cone, Nelson	No
9492	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	gerhard, delia	No
9493	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McFaye, Adrienne	No
9494	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		scholz, ernest J	No
9495	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnbaum, Bruce B	No
9496	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9497	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Breakfield, Sara	Yes
9498	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sato, Nancy E	No
9499	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	sales	Galan, Martha S	Yes
9500	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Futrell, Robin A	Yes
9501	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Haaning, Quentin C	No
9502	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		KLINKENBERG, KATHLEEN	Yes
9503	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Nancy G	Yes
9504	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Catton, N/A	Yes
9505	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vanderbeek, Fred T	Yes
9506	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Chadran, Achmad M	No
9507	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	None	Bonilla-Jones, Carmen E	No
9508	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yang, Jo-Shing	No
9509	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9510	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Reilly, Patricia I	Yes
9511	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Yang, Tony C.	No
9512	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		allen, priscilla	No
9513	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yang, Yu-Mei	No
9514	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	New Games	Le Fevre, Dale N	Yes
9515	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		walker, craig	No
9516	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sorrells, Phillip	No
9517	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yang, Richard	No
9518	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Murray, Carol	No
9519	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marsh, Sherry	No
9520	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hilliard, Marion B	Yes
9521	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Majors, Judith M	No
9522	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9523	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Krueger, Bradley	No
9524	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pendleton, Marianne	Yes
9525	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lanier, Belle	No
9526	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Dumont, Lynette	No
9527	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilbert, P	Yes
9528	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelly, Alice	Yes
9529	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks organizatio	Heffron, Joshua P	Yes
9530	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		menking, susan m	Yes
9531	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Daniels, Robert	Yes
9532	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cho, Diana	Yes
9533	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9534	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cole, Thomas J	Yes
9535	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Robertson, Amy	Yes
9536	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fleischmann, Melanie	Yes
9537	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friedel, Lawrence	Yes
9538	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	DeGolier, Amber	Yes
9539	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chapman, Lori	Yes
9540	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Seaman, Barbara	Yes
9541	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lerner, Barry	Yes

0008667

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9542	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Taylor, B. J.	Yes
9543	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Eldred, Elizabeth	Yes
9544	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	York, Diane	Yes
9545	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McVey, Rena	Yes
9546	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Campbell, Michale	Yes
9547	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lepley, Lynne	Yes
9548	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Royce, Anya	Yes
9549	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Pat	Yes
9550	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gensler, Sarah	Yes
9551	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Adamson, Megan	Yes
9552	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Marcus, Paul	Yes
9553	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brindley, Monika	Yes
9554	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shemes, Hillary	Yes
9555	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Eggleston, Pat	Yes
9556	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hartley, Lara	Yes
9557	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smallman, Denise	Yes
9558	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parker, Ann K	Yes
9559	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grenard, Mark Hayduke	No
9560	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Briggs, Marla	Yes
9561	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hench, James	Yes
9562	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dobosz, Frank & Mary	Yes
9563	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beltran, Sue	Yes
9564	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ferreira, Jennifer	Yes
9565	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ivankovic, Anthony J.	Yes
9566	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	walker, craig	Yes
9567	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burton, Michele	Yes
9568	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Randall, David	Yes
9569	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weidman, Janet	No
9570	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stoltenberg, John and Martha	No
9571	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brimm, Martha	Yes
9572	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Greuel, Bridget	No
9573	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gheta, Peggy A	Yes
9574	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kaiser, Robert	No
9575	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Holt, Deborah	Yes
9576	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ackerman, Maureen	Yes
9577	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Serrato, Luanne M	No
9578	5/7/2010	No	Business	Nacajasa, Ltd.	O'Bryant, Ronda R	No
9579	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		macdonald, angus m	No
9580	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Simons, Margaret	Yes
9581	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Caldwell, Alice	Yes
9582	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks	Fekete, Mary M	Yes
9583	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9584	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schleimer, Sylvia	Yes
9585	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yarnell, Susan L	No
9586	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks	Fekete, Mary M	Yes
9587	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hillegass, Gene A	No
9588	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		schaming, carol b	No
9589	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomson, Arran E	Yes
9590	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McCarty, Chris	Yes
9591	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Curran, claire	Yes
9592	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kurland, Anthony	Yes
9593	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		dewitt, ae	Yes
9594	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DiMento, Louis	No

0008668

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9595	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Le, Luan V	Yes
9596	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Cunnally, John J	No
9597	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Mann, Sandra	Yes
9598	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kitchens, Peter	Yes
9599	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		wright, dian	No
9600	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9601	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Braithwaite, Georgia	Yes
9602	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Porter, Steven Y	Yes
9603	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPA	Moldovan, Robert J	Yes
9604	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilreath, Orville S	Yes
9605	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9606	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Daul, Sandra R	Yes
9607	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goodin, Ben	No
9608	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Siskron, Kathleen	Yes
9609	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		karlson, fred	No
9610	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sechrist, Shelley	No
9611	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Silver, G.	Yes
9612	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NCPA	Farkash, Stephanie	No
9613	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sellen, Betty-Carol	No
9614	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Held, Monica L	Yes
9615	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9616	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	public citizen	McClain, Barbara A	No
9617	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Baker-Smith, Gerritt and Elizabeth	No
9618	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stone-Meyer, Virginia	No
9619	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Grace, Joan M	No
9620	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bechtel, Paul	No
9621	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Denmon, Pam	Yes
9622	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chilcoat, D	Yes
9623	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bishop, Stacey	Yes
9624	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mitchell, Donna	Yes
9625	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shuford, Carla	Yes
9626	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kays, Ellen	Yes
9627	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Macdonald, Angus m	Yes
9628	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Lori	Yes
9629	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kirkman, Susan	Yes
9630	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Yarnell, Susan	Yes
9631	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Simons, Bob	Yes
9632	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gunay, Zeki	Yes
9633	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dawson, Joseph	Yes
9634	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, D	Yes
9635	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Keys, Sharon	Yes
9636	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whitehead, Kimberlee	Yes
9637	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mcwilliams, Erik	Yes
9638	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kriegler, Bertha	No
9639	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sams, Donna	No
9640	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bruno, Jon	Yes
9641	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walsh, Dianne	Yes
9642	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Geiler, Shelley	Yes
9643	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	roberts, les	Yes
9644	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jackson, Lynn	Yes
9645	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walters, Patricia	Yes
9646	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCreary, Grant	Yes

0008669

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9647	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loquvam, Mary	Yes
9648	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ibarra, Suni	Yes
9649	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Brock, Dolly	Yes
9650	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		marcus, stuart	No
9651	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCS	Taylor, Red	No
9652	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sylvia, Joan E	No
9653	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hartinian, Linda	No
9654	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Liebeskind, Al	No
9655	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Long, Julie	Yes
9656	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Patricia	No
9657	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moore, Wayne	No
9658	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Seff, Joshua J	No
9659	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moss, Robert	No
9660	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Erickson, Josiah	No
9661	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carter, Judith L	No
9662	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walsh, Thomas J	No
9663	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stone, Annette L	Yes
9664	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Skeele, Colin M	Yes
9665	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Winkel, Marguerite L	No
9666	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Tuscher, Ralph	Yes
9667	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Singleton, Thomas L	Yes
9668	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bass, Brenda M	No
9669	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKiernan, Cheryl	No
9670	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Treat, Martin A	Yes
9671	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams , David C	No
9672	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ognjanovic, Michelle	No
9673	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9674	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Harlan, Marilyn D	Yes
9675	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		clements, patricia	No
9676	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Shade, Patricia M	Yes
9677	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		OConnor, Cornelius	Yes
9678	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cannon, John	No
9679	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		CHAMBERS, EDITH	Yes
9680	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hedges, Ken	Yes
9681	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Valtri Burgess, Vivian	Yes
9682	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gubler, Lawrence	Yes
9683	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Preston, George L	Yes
9684	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		klass, david	Yes
9685	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9686	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation	Odell, Katharine O	No
9687	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9688	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corson, Wynne R	Yes
9689	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Jack B	No
9690	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hinson, Samantha L	No
9691	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		guzman, carl	No
9692	5/7/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Walls, Jim	No
9693	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nation Parks Conservation Association	Williams, Nicholas M	No
9694	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Boone, James	Yes

0008670

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9695	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Wagner, Linda	No
9696	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Diana	Yes
9697	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bozarth, Stanley	Yes
9698	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weissman, Warren	Yes
9699	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Joy, Veda	Yes
9700	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Norton, Jane	Yes
9701	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schmidt, Barbara	Yes
9702	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Levin, Jon	No
9703	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Towson, Margaret	Yes
9704	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Witmer, Carol	Yes
9705	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Goll, Conrad&Eileen	Yes
9706	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wooldridge, Marylouise	Yes
9707	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Malghan, Suhas	Yes
9708	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Usry, Amy	Yes
9709	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hoover, Jessica	Yes
9710	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Epley, Regina	Yes
9711	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hanfman, Jane	Yes
9712	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Adams, Steve	Yes
9713	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hudson, Gail	Yes
9714	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Barbara D	Yes
9715	5/7/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Paleias, Linda	Yes
9716	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Laskey, Brian	Yes
9717	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fiorini, Mark	No
9718	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	The Nature Conservancy	Schroeder, Gary W	No
9719	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9720	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kendrick, Cindy	Yes
9721	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Frank	No
9722	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Singleton, Thomas	Yes
9723	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tigar, Jane	Yes
9724	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ganley, Roxanne	Yes
9725	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kaplan, Mary Jane	Yes
9726	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, Randy R	Yes
9727	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Nilsen, Jeffrey M	No
9728	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davidson, James	Yes
9729	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Greemore Gallipo, Nancy F	Yes
9730	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Dena	No
9731	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service of California	Goldstein, Susan R	Yes
9732	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
9733	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brach, Felicity D	Yes
9734	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Knezha, Lisa	No
9735	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9736	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Mackay, Donald S	Yes
9737	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holtzman, Dorothy	Yes
9738	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Peralta, Sharon L	No
9739	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Odry, Susanna	No
9740	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Medzihradsky, Oliver	Yes
9741	5/7/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual	EastKB	Chandler, Mike	Yes
9742	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Andersen, Kristen	Yes
9743	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008671

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9744	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Evans, Elise	Yes
9745	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spickler, Julie	Yes
9746	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Corbat, Richard	No
9747	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
9748	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		von Giebel, Robert G	No
9749	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc.	Haupt, Lois	No
9750	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gray, Tony	Yes
9751	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Billie	Yes
9752	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
9753	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Patricia	No
9754	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPac	Rideout, James	No
9755	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Burr, Eric L	No
9756	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Koenigsberg, Lynne	No
9757	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Frachtman, Brianna	No
9758	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Wallace, Deb	No
9759	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Aderhold, Steve	Yes
9760	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mauney, Harry F	Yes
9761	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schlesinger, Sybil E	No
9762	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mehlman, Jean P	No
9763	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Griffin, Amy	Yes
9764	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9765	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9766	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bannon, Roseann	Yes
9767	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Abadia, Betty	Yes
9768	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nguyen, Tien	Yes
9769	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Geiss, J	Yes
9770	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Novey, George	Yes
9771	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pat, Gor	Yes
9772	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CAMLT	Klipfel II, George F	Yes
9773	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jones, Brena	Yes
9774	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Walthers, Lisa	Yes
9775	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mowrey, Jo-Ann	Yes
9776	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barton, Cathy	Yes
9777	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Collins, Carol	Yes
9778	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barnett, Brittany	Yes
9779	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Willis, Karen	Yes
9780	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9781	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Arnold, Richard A	No
9782	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bates, Scott R	No
9783	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hanson, Art	No
9784	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Johanna L	No
9785	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oakman, Diane	No
9786	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	SCHLAGMAN, DANIEL	No
9787	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, James	Yes
9788	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sandow, B	Yes
9789	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Castner, Emily	Yes
9790	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cancell, June	Yes
9791	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dykstra, Ruth & Mr. Brian	Yes
9792	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	miatech, steve	Yes
9793	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stone, Cindy	Yes
9794	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sasse, Julian	Yes
9795	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fumarolo, Diana	Yes

0008672

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9796	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Citizens for Planetary Health	Robinson, Bina A	No
9797	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Busch, Ruth c	Yes
9798	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Severini, Nina M	No
9799	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harvey, M & J	No
9800	5/7/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9801	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crossley, Jean	No
9802	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Waltzer, Mark L	No
9803	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bitler, Barbara A	Yes
9804	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Delutt, Ans	No
9805	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perricelli, Claire	No
9806	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bannister, Susan	Yes
9807	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kubalek, Angela J	Yes
9808	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	D'Ooge, Ben	Yes
9809	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Keim Comley, Nancy	Yes
9810	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	U.S.C.G, Aux.	Coleman, Carl W	No
9811	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lucas, Mary	Yes
9812	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Horton, Helen C	Yes
9813	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l. Parks Conservation Association	Lighthall, Tim H	No
9814	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks	Coulson, Elyse	Yes
9815	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Natl. Parks Conservation Association	Nettesheim, Barbara	No
9816	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caine, Lisa	No
9817	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9818	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bjorn, Jeff	Yes
9819	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Wright, Steven D	Yes
9820	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Birchard, Ethan K	No
9821	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tuomey, James & Ann Ellen	No
9822	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9823	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Otis, David W	No
9824	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9825	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9826	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hammer, Randy	Yes
9827	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9828	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Prescott, Kathlene M	Yes
9829	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, Shannon A	Yes
9830	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sullivan, Robert A	No
9831	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kaiser, Katherine E	No
9832	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Matthews, Jennifer L	No
9833	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stacey, M. A	Yes
9834	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Austin, Laird A	No
9835	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wright, Kirstin E	No
9836	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leonard, Les	Yes
9837	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelley, Timothy	Yes
9838	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Percival, Terry	Yes
9839	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kessler, Susan	No
9840	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Coon, John	No
9841	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9842	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wittenberg, Sara	No
9843	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mink, Daniel G	No
9844	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9845	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fischer, Lynn	No

0008673

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9846	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardman, Peggy J	No
9847	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Goodlin, David	Yes
9848	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Torres, Rocio	Yes
9849	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hylton, Nicole	Yes
9850	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wight, Darin	Yes
9851	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miller, Colleen	Yes
9852	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Combs, Mary	Yes
9853	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ramsey, Don	Yes
9854	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Logan, Laura	Yes
9855	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mauney, Harry	Yes
9856	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Batovsky, Natalie	Yes
9857	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sandahl, Della	Yes
9858	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hass, Marjorie A	No
9859	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Caraballo, A	Yes
9860	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sepulveda, John	Yes
9861	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Malick, Laura	Yes
9862	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Phillips, Lynn	Yes
9863	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sherrill, Cynthia	Yes
9864	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Majorowicz, Erin	Yes
9865	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Anton	Yes
9866	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Migdal, Marcia	Yes
9867	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thompson, Elizabeth K	Yes
9868	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Traum, Norman	No
9869	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Colon, Ilona	Yes
9870	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ohara, Sharon	Yes
9871	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Malara, Stephanie	Yes
9872	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pieper, phyllis	Yes
9873	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wears, mary	Yes
9874	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robertson, Jennifer	Yes
9875	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	White, Lois	Yes
9876	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lathbury, Begona	Yes
9877	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Griswold, Dave	No
9878	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Vincent, Joseph I	No
9879	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mundy, Janice -	Yes
9880	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Urban, Richard G	No
9881	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Sandri, Ken F	Yes
9882	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mueller, Laura	Yes
9883	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Vosburg, Robin	Yes
9884	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9885	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ross, Linda R	No
9886	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9887	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Johnson, Edward	Yes
9888	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NEW JAM	Silvert Newell, Hilary	Yes
9889	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Samenfeld, Herbert W	No
9890	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NCPA	Lyle, Kent	No
9891	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Connell, Karen E	Yes
9892	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Bannister, Julie	No
9893	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carroll, Kathleen	Yes
9894	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kepner, Susan	Yes
9895	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schuhrke, Nancy S	Yes
9896	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dalka, R	Yes
9897	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Delaney, Patrick	No
9898	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reedy, Laraine	No
9899	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008674

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9900	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dymkowski, Evelyn J	No
9901	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		POWELL, MARTHA	No
9902	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Novkov, Russell J	No
9903	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hulbert, Charles R	No
9904	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kabcenell, Brian	No
9905	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goike, Karen E	No
9906	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hulbert, Charles R	No
9907	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Merrill, Rodney	Yes
9908	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Singer, Greg	Yes
9909	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	national parks conservation assoc	Pellett, Ocean	Yes
9910	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Babbitt, Susan M	Yes
9911	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9912	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Switzer, Sharon L	Yes
9913	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Routh, Dedra C	No
9914	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hesse & Doug Dyer, Susanne	No
9915	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Klemm, Jerry K	No
9916	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Janet	Yes
9917	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Palmquist, Sandra J	Yes
9918	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rinker, Robert	No
9919	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parker, Donna	No
9920	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra	Chambers, Timothy B	No
9921	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Strijek, Claudia	No
9922	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Inslee, J. William	Yes
9923	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		pomerantz, fred	No
9924	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Reichardt, Dorothy M	No
9925	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9926	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Belz, Paul G	Yes
9927	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lilleleht, Lembit U	No
9928	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seifried, Richard D	Yes
9929	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thrasher, Amber	No
9930	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mead, Maggie	No
9931	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Templer, John	Yes
9932	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Savage, Rei	Yes
9933	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Childs, Stephen	Yes
9934	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	U.S. Citizen	Adams, L.J. J	Yes
9935	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kaiser, Katie	Yes
9936	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Radcliffe, Brian	Yes
9937	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wilson, Cassandra	Yes
9938	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hoepfner, Lydia	Yes
9939	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, N/A	Yes
9940	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carlton, Toni	Yes
9941	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Yater, Joan	Yes
9942	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Morgan, Marian	Yes
9943	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brown, Doug	Yes
9944	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Baum, Robert	Yes
9945	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Edwards, Patricia	Yes
9946	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wagner, Donna	Yes
9947	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Onoff, Paula	Yes
9948	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Farley, Tammy	Yes
9949	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9950	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Strowd, Richard E	No
9951	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rueppel, Kathleen	No
9952	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lenhart, Donna	No

0008675

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
9953	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9954	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keller, Rudolph	Yes
9955	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Manning, Judi	Yes
9956	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Granton, Catherine	Yes
9957	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Phillips, Rachael	Yes
9958	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Denys	No
9959	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Oggiono, Nanette	No
9960	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9961	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hobbs, Michael	No
9962	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9963	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation	Carroll, Thomas	No
9964	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Benjamin, Patricia	No
9965	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9966	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cervoni, Toni	No
9967	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
9968	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carter, Larry L	Yes
9969	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carroll, Mark T	No
9970	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kaspar, Patricia J	Yes
9971	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Lawrence Brook Watershed Partnership	Shakarjian, Michael P	Yes
9972	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Shepherd, Wayne	No
9973	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Katherine E	Yes
9974	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Robertshaw, K.K.	Yes
9975	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reeve, Donna	No
9976	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Patterson, Dale P	No
9977	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		BUNCH, BETTY N	Yes
9978	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Donahue, Meredith	No
9979	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Peters, Bruce	No
9980	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9981	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Laiiski, Caleb	No
9982	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Troup, Brenda P	No
9983	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	borg, lennea e	Yes
9984	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark III, Edward F	Yes
9985	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Conservation Association	Kirks, James H	Yes
9986	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	League of Women Voters	N/A, N/A	No
9987	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Holmes, Brian R	Yes
9988	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Scotts Valley Rotary	Marden, Jack J	Yes
9989	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	self	Laguarta, Donald E	Yes
9990	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, William T	No
9991	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Novick, Colin M	No
9992	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		robinson, richard m	No
9993	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
9994	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Filigenzi, John J	No
9995	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, M S	No
9996	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corriere, Caryn L	No
9997	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooke, Katherine	No
9998	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Skotnicki, Rives	No
9999	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fariss, Nan	Yes
10000	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Becky	Yes
10001	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rasmussen, Jamie	Yes
10002	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bizzell, Beverly	Yes
10003	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Birch, Susan	Yes
10004	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Aldrich, Todd	Yes
10005	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McDaniel, Carolyn	Yes

0008676

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10006	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	West Jr, Earl	Yes
10007	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reece, Gwendolyn	Yes
10008	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Parcheta, Susan	Yes
10009	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sudderth, Shannon	Yes
10010	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Kenneth	Yes
10011	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	GreenPeace	Gottejman, Brian L	No
10012	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fairman, Marcia	Yes
10013	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Combs, Bruce	Yes
10014	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Diane	Yes
10015	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ingianni, Martin	Yes
10016	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cunningham, James m	Yes
10017	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Summey, Matthew	Yes
10018	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Siddique, Omar	Yes
10019	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kreitzberg, M. Sharon	No
10020	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bell, Ronald	Yes
10021	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Della-Volpe, Tisa	Yes
10022	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Puca, Robert	Yes
10023	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mac Bean, William	No
10024	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brandariz, Anita	Yes
10025	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sintov, Joe & Joan	Yes
10026	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	meyer, laurie	Yes
10027	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mirsky, Hank	Yes
10028	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bell, Lisa	Yes
10029	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Denney, Jerrold	Yes
10030	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ford, IHM, Mary Ann	Yes
10031	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leppala, Patti	Yes
10032	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanford, Rita	Yes
10033	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sept, Melodie	Yes
10034	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cain, Christine	Yes
10035	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	rider, heather	Yes
10036	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pula, Robert	Yes
10037	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10038	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, Jennifer L	No
10039	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Palmer, Janine	Yes
10040	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Benjamin	No
10041	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10042	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Ahlgrim, Larry	No
10043	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Evans, Michael W	No
10044	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10045	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Allen, Karon G	No
10046	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10047	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NCPA	Meslar, Gerald	No
10048	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Weggel, Bob J	Yes
10049	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rowen, Robinmaire -	No
10050	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Solomon, Kellis R	No
10051	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Natioanl Parks & Conservation Assoc.	Stanley, Priscilla	Yes
10052	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10053	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Seese, Sherry	Yes
10054	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Illinois Audubon Society	Duman, Bonnie	Yes
10055	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Nadel, Russell	No
10056	5/7/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Cosner, Bob	Yes
10057	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Seeman, Anne	No

0008677

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10058	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10059	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Szostak, Anita L	No
10060	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, N/A	Yes
10061	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		White, Phyllis	No
10062	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCabe, Rita	No
10063	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hovendon, Barbara	No
10064	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sittler, Lauren	Yes
10065	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Douglass, Barbara	Yes
10066	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Webber, Margaret	Yes
10067	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ellis, Charles	Yes
10068	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rennix, Tiffany	Yes
10069	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ridge, Susan	Yes
10070	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hagan, Patty	Yes
10071	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	bronstein, elaine	Yes
10072	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nadel, Russell	Yes
10073	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Yates, Karin	Yes
10074	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	martin, susan	Yes
10075	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		van Veenendaal, Ruth	No
10076	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hetzler, Tim	Yes
10077	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Russell, Maureen	Yes
10078	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeReiter-Kolb, Nicole	Yes
10079	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bail, Christopher	Yes
10080	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gloe, Janice	Yes
10081	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Helsing, James	Yes
10082	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	shaffer, grant	Yes
10083	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blois, Elizabeth	Yes
10084	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woodriff, Elaine	Yes
10085	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ROBERTS, ILENE	Yes
10086	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoeffner, Noelle	Yes
10087	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Limberly, Justin	Yes
10088	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schreiner, Christine	Yes
10089	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Suess, Jennifer W	No
10090	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Wildlife Organization	Hamilton, Maxine T	Yes
10091	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10092	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Madison, Chelsea	Yes
10093	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Spotts, Richard A	Yes
10094	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	me myself I	Clark, Jacob R	Yes
10095	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Oxyer, Jim	No
10096	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	the Ave Project	Richard, David E	No
10097	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Jorgensen, Martin C	Yes
10098	5/7/2010	No	Business	Loki Design	Loken, Rebecca	No
10099	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	ciu, scott	No
10100	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10101	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ciu, Sezar	No
10102	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Montag, Maria	No
10103	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Farrell, Timothy	No
10104	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hausia, Kelly	Yes
10105	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	N/A	Palos, Linda	Yes
10106	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ciu, Barbara	Yes
10107	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Peace and Freedom Party, on the ballot in Ca.	Harrison, Norma J F	No
10108	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10109	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Moore, Karl	Yes

0008678

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10110	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10111	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Alexander, Mark L	Yes
10112	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Zazow, Jamie	Yes
10113	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	sierra club	Cottrell, Lee a	No
10114	5/7/2010	No	Business	jwtGroup, PC	New, Robert J	No
10115	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Conserv Assoc	Boutin, Dolores	Yes
10116	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Polens, Jared	Yes
10117	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10118	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Derr, Meredith G	Yes
10119	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lambert, Billie F	No
10120	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Campbell, James A	Yes
10121	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thompson, Thomas	No
10122	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lipper, Carol L	No
10123	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		MORALES, ROSY	Yes
10124	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holmes, James J	No
10125	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Franklin, Sandra E	No
10126	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hestnes, Elizabeth	No
10127	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	SIERRA	DURLAND, MARCIA A	Yes
10128	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10129	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Slayman, Clark S	No
10130	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Roland, Dawn M	No
10131	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sampery, Michelle	Yes
10132	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	PETSCO SR., JOHN	Yes
10133	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Link, Peggy	Yes
10134	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Donley, Melissa	Yes
10135	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lieberman, Laura	Yes
10136	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carr, Brian	Yes
10137	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vinciguerra, Lucie	Yes
10138	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gosche, Jennie	Yes
10139	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Levesque, Amanda	Yes
10140	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cole, Erica	Yes
10141	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wick, Jodi	Yes
10142	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rosenfelder, Chris	Yes
10143	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Meyer, Derek	Yes
10144	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	monroe, betsy	Yes
10145	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	von Dedenroth, Brian P	Yes
10146	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Phillips, George	Yes
10147	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Begonja, OSL, Fr. Tony	Yes
10148	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reed, Stephanie L	Yes
10149	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Janssen, John and Sue	No
10150	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Core-Stine, Erin	Yes
10151	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hickman, Laura	Yes
10152	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Neely, Kathy	Yes
10153	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Overton, Sarita	Yes
10154	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Toush, Lawrence	Yes
10155	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mizel, Vicki	Yes
10156	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moreno, Tony	Yes
10157	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cisna, Todd B	Yes
10158	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Sherry	Yes
10159	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Coops, Lorraine	Yes
10160	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zinck, James R	Yes
10161	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Consevation Association	Miller, Sandra E	No
10162	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Chambers, Bruce D	Yes

0008679

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10163	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Sturk, William L	Yes
10164	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Notton, Laura	No
10165	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Yakoban, Steve	Yes
10166	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Silverman, Marc	No
10167	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Taber, Lucile J T	No
10168	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	United Nations Assn.	Dishon, Catherine D	Yes
10169	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10170	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Ruth	Yes
10171	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Nancy K	No
10172	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kuch, Eileen H	Yes
10173	5/7/2010	Potential (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Franks, Beth R	Yes
10174	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Perkins, Joel	Yes
10175	5/7/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Suter, Catherine	No
10176	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Nattional Parks	Lindberg@surerwest.net, John	No
10177	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gallagher, Melissa	Yes
10178	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Armijo, Knoxann M	No
10179	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		James, David W	Yes
10180	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10181	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lloyd, A	Yes
10182	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lipper, Carol	Yes
10183	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Macnelly, Susan	Yes
10184	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Burson, Claire	Yes
10185	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Keesling, Sara	Yes
10186	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Faust, Julie	Yes
10187	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lehman, Orv	Yes
10188	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	The Green Chalet	Pokorny, Jeff S	Yes
10189	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hill, Sharon	Yes
10190	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Guinn, Barbara	Yes
10191	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boysen, Ruth	Yes
10192	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Channing, Chelsea	Yes
10193	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hennis, Karen	Yes
10194	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hollar, Jeffrey	Yes
10195	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Warfle, Jamee	Yes
10196	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wilson, Mary	Yes
10197	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Santora, Mark	Yes
10198	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brock, Don	Yes
10199	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Adam	Yes
10200	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scribner, Denee	Yes
10201	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taylor, Ricky	Yes
10202	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Philip	Yes
10203	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Margaret	Yes
10204	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goldenberg, Helen A	Yes
10205	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Curtis, Bob	Yes
10206	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilman, Monica	No
10207	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10208	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Burroughs, Karen L	Yes
10209	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cuff, Kermit	No
10210	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Zullo, Michael	Yes
10211	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Morgan, John D	Yes
10212	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Climate Protection Campaign	Lease, Karin P	Yes
10213	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McLane, Kathleen	No
10214	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Harquail, Raymond D	Yes
10215	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gathing, Nancy A	No

0008680

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10216	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hurlburt, Richard L	No
10217	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Sawyers, Carol	Yes
10218	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bloom, Gary A	No
10219	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service Association	Carlo, Dorothy	Yes
10220	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		davis, Elizabeth	Yes
10221	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Spencer, Martha P	Yes
10222	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fosburgh, Eric	No
10223	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Steitz, Diane	No
10224	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Khalsa, Mha Atma S	No
10225	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, adrienne	Yes
10226	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		belcastro, frank	No
10227	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schweiger, Nan	Yes
10228	5/7/2010	Potential (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barth, Ellen	No
10229	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barad, Janet	Yes
10230	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cummings, Cindy	Yes
10231	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jared, Roy A	No
10232	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lastella, John	Yes
10233	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Falk, Bonnie	Yes
10234	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Todd, Alicia	Yes
10235	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dickerson, Pam	Yes
10236	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hutchison, Shawn	Yes
10237	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wheeler, Jenny	Yes
10238	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cooper, Kathy	Yes
10239	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wheeler, Jenny	Yes
10240	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Flake, E.L.	Yes
10241	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dowling, Corinne	Yes
10242	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Swiger, Edmund G	No
10243	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Veon, Duane	Yes
10244	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stange, Elizabeth	Yes
10245	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tamashiro, Joyce	Yes
10246	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Chen, Allan	Yes
10247	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Morrell, Steven	No
10248	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10249	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10250	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, Michael L	No
10251	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Card-Derr, Geraldine N	No
10252	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cleland-Sipfle, Kate	Yes
10253	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	schult, abby	No
10254	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Womack, Kristin	Yes
10255	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Atkins, Carol L	Yes
10256	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Honigstock, David	Yes
10257	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ascher, Alan	Yes
10258	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stevning-Roe, Ann E	No
10259	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10260	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Birchfield, Rani	Yes
10261	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McCarthy, Pamela	Yes
10262	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Felicetti, Ann	Yes
10263	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Killeen, Kevin J	No
10264	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McLaughlin, Melissa	Yes
10265	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sellers, Jennifer	Yes
10266	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pace, Lucy	Yes
10267	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finnegan, Shawneen	Yes

0008681

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10268	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dimeo, Rocco	Yes
10269	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA, Sierra Club	Moore, Robert T	No
10270	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hanson, Natalie	No
10271	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Darst, Caroline G	No
10272	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		rinne, fred I	No
10273	5/7/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Yosemite Area Audubon	Young, Lowell J	No
10274	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wynn, Margaret	No
10275	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wash, Rhonda J	Yes
10276	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Antuna, Martin	Yes
10277	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10278	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Ratner, Ronald H	No
10279	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kolter, Phillip L	Yes
10280	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Marcus, Jack David	No
10281	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Witney, Katherine D	Yes
10282	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Doyle, Patt	No
10283	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Woolsey, Amber	No
10284	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Slagle, Steve	No
10285	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ward, Esq., Stacey A	Yes
10286	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, N/A	No
10287	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10288	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	George, Jacob	Yes
10289	5/7/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Risk, Micah	Yes
10290	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10291	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Turner, Lawrence	No
10292	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keogh, Joseph J	Yes
10293	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clift, Robert	Yes
10294	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Knell, Matthew	Yes
10295	5/7/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Avery, Simon	Yes
10296	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Martinez, C. J	No
10297	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Voorhies, Eric	No
10298	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McBride, Ellen	Yes
10299	5/7/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Delaine, Sheri	No
10300	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Jobs with Justice	King, Dave	No
10301	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10302	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Coudurier, Muriel P	Yes
10303	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Vallone, Cheryl L	No
10304	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, N/A	Yes
10305	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Tri-Valley CAREs	Swyers, Matthew	No
10306	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rouhana, Alexander M	No
10307	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weinberger, Mark S	Yes
10308	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kim, Joanne	Yes
10309	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Taylor, B.	Yes
10310	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mariante, Jonathan	Yes
10311	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Tyler, Steve	No
10312	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henry, Lillian	Yes
10313	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Arbuckle, Nancy	Yes
10314	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wallach, Aleta	Yes
10315	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Evelyn	Yes
10316	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Baton Rouge Community College	Medlin, Tony E	No
10317	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Noto, Ursula M	Yes
10318	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Antietam Valley Animal Hospital	Wagner, Briana F	No

0008682

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10319	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10320	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Porter, Kathleen	No
10321	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Branfman, Reuben	No
10322	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwank, Eleanor J	Yes
10323	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barnoski, Joseph	Yes
10324	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kovacs, Louis C	Yes
10325	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Porter, Kathleen	Yes
10326	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vasquez, Ileana	Yes
10327	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ostoich, Julie	Yes
10328	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hofman, Lindsay	Yes
10329	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Conservation Assoc	Tucker, Brenda C	No
10330	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Vaughn, Edward	No
10331	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Travis, Teri L	No
10332	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Michael	Yes
10333	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hevener, Linda	Yes
10334	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		cuviello, pat	Yes
10335	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Katz, David	No
10336	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tomczyk, Martine	Yes
10337	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hendricks, Maureen	Yes
10338	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Dr. Michael	No
10339	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Miranda, Sophie E	No
10340	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hayslip, Greg	No
10341	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tindall, Matthew	Yes
10342	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dunnivant, Kathy	Yes
10343	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Leisenring, John	Yes
10344	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Verruni, Lauren	Yes
10345	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Cecile	No
10346	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goodnough, Jenny	Yes
10347	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cox, Jeff	No
10348	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	McIntosh, Leah	No
10349	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wolfe, JoAnn	Yes
10350	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Murphy, Marcus Q	No
10351	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10352	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schubert, Peter	Yes
10353	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10354	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nerode, Gregory	No
10355	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Russo, Michelle	Yes
10356	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brainard, Verna	Yes
10357	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harrison, Cheryl	Yes
10358	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Escobar, Victor	Yes
10359	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		hughes, karan e	Yes
10360	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Winkler, Maria	Yes
10361	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miranda, Sophie	Yes
10362	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10363	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Waltman, Karen M	No
10364	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Newstate, Melanie	No
10365	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Plavac, Anjuli	Yes
10366	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Maryanne	Yes
10367	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beacham, D	No
10368	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Skal, Steven E	No
10369	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	EAP	Grobe, Nicola	No
10370	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nedeau, E. James	No
10371	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes

0008683

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10372	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		FINNELLI, MARILYN & TOM	Yes
10373	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	ART CONSULTING: SCANDINAVIA, Books on Art & Architecture	Hansen, Lena T	Yes
10374	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gibson, Debbie A	Yes
10375	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Selander, Spencer	No
10376	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McKenzie, Danielle	Yes
10377	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Call, Kayla	Yes
10378	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Sonia	Yes
10379	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ford, Shirley	Yes
10380	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	zaban, nicole	Yes
10381	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Frink, Allyson	No
10382	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kennel, John R	Yes
10383	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		boyington, charles r	No
10384	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10385	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Toll, Charles H	No
10386	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Trent, Timothy E	No
10387	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwartz, Don	Yes
10388	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Sobieski, Mona P	Yes
10389	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, john h	No
10390	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10391	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Anderson, Alyssa	Yes
10392	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Peltier, Katerina	Yes
10393	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lewis, Alvia	Yes
10394	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Allen, Lee	Yes
10395	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tackney, Marcie	Yes
10396	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	GILBERT, JAN	No
10397	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		cunningham, stacey M	No
10398	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Buckley, Jeffrey D	Yes
10399	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sellers, Rita	Yes
10400	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Knight, Kelleen	Yes
10401	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Alexander, Mary E.	Yes
10402	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wyant, Debbie	Yes
10403	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	isaacs, johanna	Yes
10404	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Colombo, Scott	Yes
10405	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Lins, Suzan	No
10406	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Saylor, Rob and Beth	No
10407	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10408	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10409	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, Gail j	No
10410	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelleher, Karen D	Yes
10411	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fluet, Christine H	Yes
10412	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Panayi, Chris P	No
10413	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Heard, Little Sun S	No
10414	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Breeding, Connie	Yes
10415	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Della-Volpe, Bronwyn	Yes
10416	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rhoads, Angela V	No
10417	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, John H.	Yes
10418	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Herbert, Jan	Yes
10419	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Stump, Robert	No
10420	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008684

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10421	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Florida Environmental Society (Founder)	Hardin, Michael J	No
10422	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Eldridge, Karen	Yes
10423	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kirk, Nancy Jo	Yes
10424	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wood, Margaret	No
10425	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudson, Sigmund	No
10426	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Mattox, Mike	Yes
10427	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Benson, John O	No
10428	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NCPA	Goering, Arden E	Yes
10429	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Doucet, Lisha	No
10430	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ledden, Dennis G	No
10431	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wehrung, Mary N	Yes
10432	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGlannan, Dorian	No
10433	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10434	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Delgado, Deborah	Yes
10435	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Hara, Amanda	Yes
10436	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, phyllis	Yes
10437	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Downey, Lisa	Yes
10438	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Melissa A	Yes
10439	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peppercorn, Marge	Yes
10440	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Armour, Cynthia	Yes
10441	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ashner, Michael J	No
10442	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Commons, Sandy	Yes
10443	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		laker, Dr julia l	Yes
10444	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10445	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		eaton, paula m	No
10446	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Conservation Assoc.	Way, Elizabeth	Yes
10447	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kellar, Kenneth A	No
10448	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	WWF	Zucchi, Carlo	Yes
10449	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Lamb, D L	No
10450	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		deSeta, Maxine	Yes
10451	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schramke, Carol J	No
10452	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brinsky, Kris E	Yes
10453	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	White, Gary F	No
10454	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park	Kato, ruka	Yes
10455	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kehoe, Therese	Yes
10456	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ferraro, Lou	Yes
10457	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Regetz, Jeannette	Yes
10458	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Golden, Gina	Yes
10459	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Haskell, James	Yes
10460	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Whitcomb, Kathleen	Yes
10461	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sonne, Frances	Yes
10462	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Andre, Brandon	Yes
10463	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Enders, Frank	Yes
10464	5/8/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Denham, Samuel D	Yes
10465	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	wild life	Warcuo, Jon R	No
10466	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dickens, Bart	No
10467	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jordan, Jim	No
10468	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kellar, Kenneth A	No
10469	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Smith, Janet B	No
10470	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Savino, Alfonsina	No
10471	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Pocahontas Club	Lemon, Patricia	Yes

0008685

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10472	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Ships Watch Association	Boggs, Edward W	Yes
10473	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barbee, Jim R	No
10474	5/8/2010	Yes (426019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rich, James s	Yes
10475	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Lusch, Mark	Yes
10476	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bateman, Dale G	Yes
10477	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Shelly, Arthur	Yes
10478	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barbee, Judy R	Yes
10479	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		White, Anne Julie	Yes
10480	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barbee, Megan R	No
10481	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ford, Julie	Yes
10482	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thompson, Meta	Yes
10483	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Murtagh, Joan	Yes
10484	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bruun, Walter	No
10485	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Toner, L. Laurie	Yes
10486	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Milks, Lisa	Yes
10487	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Marcia	Yes
10488	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McFarland, Lorraine	Yes
10489	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lindsay, Marianna	Yes
10490	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		jovanovic, Amanda	No
10491	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bateman, Michael w	No
10492	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Robert, Alain	No
10493	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		paisley, janet	Yes
10494	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	The International Center for Reiki Training	Brettin, David L	Yes
10495	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kellar, Kenneth A	No
10496	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKean, Brenda	Yes
10497	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oksanen, Fay L	Yes
10498	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Babics, William S	No
10499	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hargrove, Linda	Yes
10500	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oesterle, Kathleen	No
10501	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cogan, Richard V	No
10502	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kopecky, Norman E	No
10503	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Michael T	Yes
10504	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rosa-Re, Samantha	No
10505	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kellar, Kenneth A	No
10506	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pynchon, Patricia B	No
10507	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kellar, Kenneth A	No
10508	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10509	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10510	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Basney, Marnie J	No
10511	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gadd, Judith	Yes
10512	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wilson, Brett	Yes
10513	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Frame, Meagan	Yes
10514	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Walker, Emily	Yes
10515	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kraus, Marion	Yes
10516	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Keller, Suzanne	Yes
10517	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Walsh, Celine	Yes
10518	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Holden, Grace	Yes
10519	5/8/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Sonoran Connection	Goodwin, Ray P	No
10520	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stokes, Alfred	Yes
10521	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cox, Kathy	Yes
10522	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nichols, James	Yes
10523	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Laura	Yes
10524	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weeden, Mary	Yes
10525	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kress, Joseph	Yes
10526	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Murawski, Denise A	Yes

0008686

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10527	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kellar, Kenneth A	No
10528	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		lopes, mark	Yes
10529	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Thompson, Dennis R	Yes
10530	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		NEWMAN, WILLIAM L	No
10531	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thorbjornsen, Brian	Yes
10532	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Strausbaugh, Joan C	No
10533	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Muehlenkamp, Angel	Yes
10534	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		S., Lexi	No
10535	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Oakes, Dorothy J	Yes
10536	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Breeden, Mary W	Yes
10537	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beiber, Lynn	Yes
10538	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pagenkopf, Kris	No
10539	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Barbara F	No
10540	5/8/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Women's Eco grp	Harrington, Barbara	No
10541	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Mlkin, Arlene	No
10542	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		lord, john	Yes
10543	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beatty, Lorne	No
10544	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crosby, Donald A	No
10545	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nichols, Maureen	Yes
10546	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sorkin, Marshall	No
10547	5/8/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ckark, Neil W	Yes
10548	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamby, Tracy L	No
10549	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Jones, Michael	No
10550	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardin, Joseph	Yes
10551	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10552	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10553	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nichols, Jenny R	No
10554	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ward, barbara	No
10555	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lillard, Renee	No
10556	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bateman, Guy D	Yes
10557	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Broendel, Jane	Yes
10558	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lynch, Diane	Yes
10559	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Douglas B	Yes
10560	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Citron, Gail	Yes
10561	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brody, Irene	Yes
10562	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nahay, Paul	Yes
10563	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Johnson, Robyn	Yes
10564	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10565	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pearson-Moyers, Deborah	Yes
10566	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vanalyne, Devon	Yes
10567	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ream, Daniel	Yes
10568	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bess, Juanita	Yes
10569	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Schmidt, William G	Yes
10570	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ruthven, Amanda	Yes
10571	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	McKinnon, Ann	Yes
10572	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johansson, Verla	Yes
10573	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gustafson, Duane E	No
10574	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc	N/A, N/A	No
10575	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sniderman, Laura	Yes
10576	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Nancy	No
10577	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Whalen, Lisa M	Yes
10578	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Wildlife Federation	Randall, Dorene	Yes

0008687

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10579	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10580	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks and Conservation Association	Fishback, Steven	No
10581	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA,NRDC,EARTHJUSTICE,NATIONAL WILDLIFE AND OTHERS	Goldstein, Steven	Yes
10582	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10583	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Concus, Paul	No
10584	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bromer, Peter R	No
10585	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walston, John L	No
10586	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10587	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Busch, James	Yes
10588	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Myles, Paula M	No
10589	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walston, Phyllis	No
10590	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burson, Grace P	No
10591	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Meehan, Marilyn c	Yes
10592	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McClure, Kathy	No
10593	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10594	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Damerst, Barbara M	Yes
10595	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Gray PantheRs of Suffolk County	Engelman, Marilyn E	No
10596	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rosario, Jeannette	Yes
10597	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jaime, Natalie	Yes
10598	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Joy	Yes
10599	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Strange, Merrill	Yes
10600	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Erin	Yes
10601	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pickle, Eddie	Yes
10602	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pszanka, James	Yes
10603	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nickelsen, Richard	Yes
10604	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	perlis, roberta	Yes
10605	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ward, Linda	Yes
10606	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gallagher, Sue	Yes
10607	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Coffman, Kathy	No
10608	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Meyer, Patricia E	Yes
10609	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Cole, Sally L	No
10610	5/8/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10611	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelley, Lori A	Yes
10612	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Conservation Association	Reust, Traci L	Yes
10613	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10614	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Turner, Robert W	Yes
10615	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Somazze, Gerald P	Yes
10616	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	sierra club	meserve, john	No
10617	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Teevan, John P	Yes
10618	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		schumann, char	No
10619	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		schutt, whitney a	No
10620	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yovanov, Melissa D	No
10621	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10622	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Franklin, John	No
10623	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Magby, Jennifer L	No
10624	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoffa, Jeff	No
10625	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scott, Derek A	No
10626	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wallace, Paul	Yes
10627	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parker, Doug and Jan	No
10628	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sacramone, Ann Marie	No
10629	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008688

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10630	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Brown, Karen C	Yes
10631	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10632	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Linell, Thomas A	Yes
10633	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Walker, Matthew	Yes
10634	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Black, Louise	Yes
10635	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Staton, Audrey	Yes
10636	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dondlinger, Rebecca	Yes
10637	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilborn, Beth	Yes
10638	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Newman, Janet G	Yes
10639	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10640	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Watson, Mark	No
10641	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10642	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10643	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Roger A	Yes
10644	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Zissu, Thomas B	Yes
10645	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	member	Alomair, Luanne	No
10646	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Collier, Carol	No
10647	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whitson, Stuart	Yes
10648	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clark, Diane	Yes
10649	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Augustine, Judith	Yes
10650	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wash, Peter	Yes
10651	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boyle, Tamara	Yes
10652	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Halbig, Mark	Yes
10653	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	basler, cathi	Yes
10654	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McKinney, Kyra	Yes
10655	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vanblarcum, Linda	Yes
10656	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seamans, Gail	Yes
10657	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Blair, Ellen	Yes
10658	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Soroos, Carol S	No
10659	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club, Audubon Society	Cater, Linda B	No
10660	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Mainwaring, Constance W	No
10661	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bigney, Janet G	Yes
10662	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Roby IV, Thomas W	No
10663	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Goddard, John B	Yes
10664	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Treiber, Arlene & Larry	No
10665	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Norman, Jennifer E	Yes
10666	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pazereckas, Frances A	Yes
10667	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carter-Su, Christin	Yes
10668	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10669	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Baker, Kent L	Yes
10670	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10671	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilges, Peggy	No
10672	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	North Fork Preservation Society	Edwards, Carol V	Yes
10673	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Budd, Joan	No
10674	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thacker, Cheryl	No
10675	5/8/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		gilbert, valerie	No
10676	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10677	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		carne, carol	No
10678	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10679	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10680	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wheless, Karen S	No
10681	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Phillips, Patricia A	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10682	5/8/2010	Yes (438580)	Unaffiliated Individual		McAlister, Arthur	Yes
10683	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Augustine, Lisa	No
10684	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reichard, Mary Ellen	No
10685	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zastrow, Sandra	No
10686	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		La Mar, Kenneth B	Yes
10687	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10688	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Walters, Constance	Yes
10689	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rogers, Rosemary	Yes
10690	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Capowich, Suzanne	No
10691	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Deb	Yes
10692	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Rachel	Yes
10693	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ledford, Janette	Yes
10694	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kegley, Roger	Yes
10695	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hutson, Jennifer	Yes
10696	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Slesinger, Art	Yes
10697	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Crase, Kirsten	Yes
10698	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sokola, Kathy	Yes
10699	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Geiger, Linda	Yes
10700	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Parket, Brian	Yes
10701	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Peloso, Chris	Yes
10702	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Blair, Jean	No
10703	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Mullany, Maryanne	No
10704	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeLurgio, Mary K and Joe	Yes
10705	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reifschneider, Jill	Yes
10706	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tremblay, Nancy	Yes
10707	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sylvander-Sodano, Jackie	Yes
10708	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seltzer, Juliana	Yes
10709	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Liberty Acres Farm	Johnson, Rebecca K	No
10710	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vincent, Judith	Yes
10711	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garcia, Yolanda	Yes
10712	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Francis, Eldon	Yes
10713	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jansohn, Kathleen	Yes
10714	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Phillips, Clifford S	No
10715	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA LIFE	Northcutt, Bobby	No
10716	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10717	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hall, Michaela	No
10718	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwester, Audrey	No
10719	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Blair, Thomas J	No
10720	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schlessinger, Susan	Yes
10721	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Washburn, Thomas	Yes
10722	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Waffner, Lois	No
10723	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Brown, Stephanie C	No
10724	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kraft, bobbie g	Yes
10725	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sustainable Environments by Design	Mazzuca, Rich J	Yes
10726	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		fink, penny	No
10727	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sandefur, Priscilla	No
10728	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Massachusetts Audubon	Wood, Sarah	No
10729	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Crockett, Landis K	No
10730	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mosher, Kim	Yes
10731	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Boylston, John	Yes
10732	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	npca	halsell, claudia	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10733	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bove, Clifford G	Yes
10734	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kirkpatrick, Jody B	Yes
10735	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dingman, Lawrence	No
10736	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10737	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Pate, Sharon	Yes
10738	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burke, Doug	No
10739	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Mencik, Jitka	No
10740	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mount, David L	Yes
10741	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Grindstaff, B.K.	Yes
10742	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dicks, Karen	Yes
10743	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Rogers, Joe	No
10744	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NCPA	Callender, Lisa M	Yes
10745	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Cole, Jennifer	No
10746	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10747	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Joiner, Elizabeth G	Yes
10748	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fonken, Gunther S	No
10749	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Kellogg, David	Yes
10750	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Conservation Association and SCA	Paul-Bonham, Scott P	Yes
10751	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Okun, Lewis E	Yes
10752	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hart, Larry	No
10753	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fant, Jason M	Yes
10754	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	national parks	temple, glenn a	Yes
10755	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Preston, Christy	Yes
10756	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Altmann, Senay	Yes
10757	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Marks, Peter	Yes
10758	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bolotin, Rick	Yes
10759	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vaniman, Jill	Yes
10760	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Beswick, Robin	Yes
10761	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stallings, Evelyn	Yes
10762	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McGuire, Renee	Yes
10763	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brown, Susan	Yes
10764	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	CRAIG, ANN	Yes
10765	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woodcock, Angela	Yes
10766	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Divito Keirn, Kathleen	Yes
10767	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Greene, Dru	Yes
10768	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assn.	Fiedler, David	No
10769	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Writer	Dixon, Jerry S	Yes
10770	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lubkemann, Jonathan	Yes
10771	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		KARMAZIN, MICHAEL L	No
10772	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ortlieb, Elizabeth A	No
10773	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10774	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelly Wright, Monica L	Yes
10775	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10776	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rechner, Diane L	Yes
10777	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zwicker, Marie Louise Morandi Long	Yes
10778	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	ACLU	Humphrey, John H	Yes
10779	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Property Owner	Bishop, John M	Yes
10780	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, Bob W	No
10781	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swisstack, Richard T	No
10782	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swisstack, Nancy L	No
10783	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Buchholz, Dorothy	No
10784	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jenkins, Danielle	No

0008691

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10785	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10786	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	League of Conservation Voters	Cahill, Irene McDonnell M	No
10787	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Starling, Greg	Yes
10788	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Alioto, Linda	Yes
10789	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Noyes, Susan	No
10790	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Columbus Audubon Society,Sec	Knight, Jane	Yes
10791	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10792	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Magliano, Steven	No
10793	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blau, Vivian	No
10794	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks	N/A, N/A	No
10795	5/8/2010	No	Non-Governmental	Sawgrass Nature Center & Wildlife Hospital	Kohl, Joan	No
10796	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	Hoffer, Cindy L	No
10797	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCluer, Carol O	No
10798	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10799	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kanarish, Michael	Yes
10800	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10801	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schroeder, Christopher R	No
10802	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dubin, Ben	No
10803	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kathary, Diana	No
10804	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	resident of earth	Banwart, Albert L	Yes
10805	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thompson, Kathy	Yes
10806	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rohe, Elizabeth	Yes
10807	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hancock, Martha	Yes
10808	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	PAisley, Janet	Yes
10809	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barber, Marty	Yes
10810	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tucker, Scott	Yes
10811	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brock, Erin	Yes
10812	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Suter, Emanuel	Yes
10813	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bello, Dominique	Yes
10814	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jezorek, Ian	Yes
10815	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gittinger, Mildred	Yes
10816	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lynn, Alice	Yes
10817	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Andrews, Linda	Yes
10818	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mancuso, Bernee	Yes
10819	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fuller, Susan	Yes
10820	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	La Mont, Sandra	Yes
10821	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holmes, Brad	Yes
10822	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Strauss, Mark	Yes
10823	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Abbott, Patricia	No
10824	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Teller, James H	No
10825	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Andrews, Richard	Yes
10826	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sze-To, Mark	Yes
10827	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lautenberg, Debra	Yes
10828	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10829	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Caudill, Sarah B	No
10830	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sambataro, Nancy J	No
10831	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10832	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10833	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10834	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Lyon, Coleen M	No
10835	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Deborah	Yes
10836	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McLellan, Donald S	No
10837	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chapas, James J	Yes

0008692

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10838	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Garrett, Susan K	No
10839	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Ocean Consevancy	Schutt, Paul	No
10840	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rossignol, Cynthia	Yes
10841	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Houser, Brian	Yes
10842	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10843	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Ormuz, Gloria S	Yes
10844	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marshall, Meadow	No
10845	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Roth, Lu	Yes
10846	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Compton, Craig A	Yes
10847	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		raubenolt, betty	Yes
10848	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Farrand, William E	Yes
10849	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Noack, Kelsey	Yes
10850	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Duval, Kimberly	Yes
10851	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mathews, Carole	Yes
10852	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bass, Patricia	Yes
10853	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Collins, Tina	Yes
10854	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Bonnie	Yes
10855	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Desjardins, Donna	Yes
10856	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gale, Ken	Yes
10857	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kahl, John	Yes
10858	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Desoto, Janet	Yes
10859	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Firth, Richard W.	Yes
10860	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kit, Gabe	Yes
10861	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Matthews, James	Yes
10862	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Flowers Ridge Homeowners Assn	Lea, Diane	No
10863	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ward, Linda J	Yes
10864	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Sullivan, Katherine	No
10865	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Evans, Margaret A	No
10866	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Johnson, Lynn M	No
10867	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		knowlton, dorothy j	Yes
10868	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Hunter, Sara	Yes
10869	5/8/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	High Country Audubon Society	Cherry, Robert P	No
10870	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		meter jr, harold a	No
10871	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, H	No
10872	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jackson, Julian	No
10873	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10874	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Darin	No
10875	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Harvey, Joe	No
10876	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		turner, phoebe	No
10877	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10878	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Perry, Claudia	Yes
10879	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		turner, phoebe	No
10880	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10881	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Peacock, Aimee	Yes
10882	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schultz, Katie	Yes
10883	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ferguson, Barbara	Yes
10884	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moore, Christina	Yes
10885	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wakiyama, Shari	Yes
10886	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stoudemire, Anna	Yes
10887	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Long, Judy	Yes
10888	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDonald-Chan, Lesa	Yes
10889	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Butz, Richard	Yes
10890	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sabol, Thomas	Yes

0008693

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10891	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Taylor, Susan	Yes
10892	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCrohan, Mary	Yes
10893	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weatherhead, Georgia C	Yes
10894	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	npca	hochendoner, bernard w	No
10895	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barlow, Coni C	No
10896	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Donovan, Sarah	No
10897	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10898	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10899	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Fox Family	Fox, Raymond L	No
10900	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hueseemann, Dr. Michael and Dr. Joyce	Yes
10901	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lester, Cathy	Yes
10902	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hirtle, John p	Yes
10903	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Caring Friends of Animals	Hughes, Patricia	No
10904	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCoy, Michele	Yes
10905	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Lynda J	Yes
10906	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Retired	Auris, Jean I	Yes
10907	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
10908	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fogleman, Anne D	No
10909	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Cordero, David and Ann I	No
10910	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		hughes, james a	Yes
10911	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Reuher, Sharon K	Yes
10912	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		hughes, james a	Yes
10913	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zucker, Marguery Lee	No
10914	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Woodrow, Elizabeth A	Yes
10915	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sherman, Helen	Yes
10916	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hornberg, Jean	Yes
10917	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Penn, Bruce R	Yes
10918	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Donnelly, Charity	Yes
10919	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	hodge, tina	Yes
10920	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sonnenschein, Mary	Yes
10921	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dillon, Sydney	Yes
10922	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Helgen, Kristofer	Yes
10923	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Watson, Pamela	Yes
10924	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NATIONAL PARKS	Johnson, Margie A	No
10925	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schwarz, Robin	Yes
10926	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reeves, William	Yes
10927	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Finberg, S	Yes
10928	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bezdek, Marjorie	Yes
10929	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Furneisen, Richard	Yes
10930	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Petersen, Jr., Carl	Yes
10931	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		sullivan, virginia	No
10932	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoppe, Kenneth	Yes
10933	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hollis, Ernest	Yes
10934	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		van Arnold, john	No
10935	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Herr, John h	Yes
10936	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sadove, Joseph	No
10937	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Getz, Caroline	Yes
10938	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Howard, Janine	No
10939	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPSC	Clifford, Raymond	Yes
10940	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Noel, Susan	No
10941	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Woodrow, Jacklyn	Yes
10942	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Death, Laurie N	Yes
10943	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	WEBB, ANN	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10944	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Zukas, Alex	No
10945	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Seltzer, Elizabeth E	Yes
10946	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Garretson, Audrey	Yes
10947	5/8/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA	Chatham, James A	No
10948	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	DFA	Ewig, Maxine	Yes
10949	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	University of Montana	Hawk, Gary W	Yes
10950	5/8/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Chatham, Susan P	No
10951	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10952	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schliff, Henry	Yes
10953	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schenk, Debra	Yes
10954	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	WEBB, ANN	No
10955	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vaughan, Laura	Yes
10956	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jackson, Diane	Yes
10957	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	teague, crystal	Yes
10958	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kuchera, Mary	Yes
10959	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Coffren, Thomas	Yes
10960	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Glaser, Katherine	Yes
10961	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siefken, Debra	Yes
10962	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Emory, Robert	Yes
10963	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bowman, Renae	Yes
10964	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keister, Robin	Yes
10965	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lapadot, Sonee	Yes
10966	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mostov, Frances	Yes
10967	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nartker, Karolyn	Yes
10968	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chriest, Shawn T	No
10969	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10970	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Aston, Robert	Yes
10971	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10972	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thorne, Trischa B	No
10973	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sillars, Rodger James	Yes
10974	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Aitken, Maria	No
10975	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Greene, David	No
10976	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Booth, Erik K	No
10977	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Cooke, James	Yes
10978	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10979	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, N/A	Yes
10980	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10981	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Coyne, Kenneth	Yes
10982	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10983	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Henry, Mallika	No
10984	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10985	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shaffer, Stacey	Yes
10986	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rennison, Angela	Yes
10987	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schram, Claire	Yes
10988	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crews, Mary Robinson	Yes
10989	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smalley, Beverly	Yes
10990	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blaine, Dyann	Yes
10991	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pizarro, Judy	Yes
10992	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Meehan, Nancy	No
10993	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mirate, Jeffrey S	No
10994	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		B, Aviva	Yes
10995	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Farneth, Sara W	Yes
10996	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rice, Susan	Yes
10997	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
10998	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

0008695

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
10999	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wolfley, Joanne R	Yes
11000	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Coleman, Judy	Yes
11001	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwenk, Kurt	No
11002	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Nantz, Robert M	Yes
11003	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		webster, cindy	Yes
11004	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		FO, Wendy	No
11005	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKenney, Christopher	No
11006	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McCune, Sean	Yes
11007	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Russell, Katherine B	Yes
11008	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11009	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Ashby, Christine M	Yes
11010	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moss, Graydon H	Yes
11011	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shimeall, Clark M	No
11012	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Skarbrevik, Brita	Yes
11013	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	march, mark	Yes
11014	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Crane, Gloria	Yes
11015	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chapin, Jessica	Yes
11016	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hubbard, Valerie	Yes
11017	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pape, Carol	Yes
11018	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ostrander, Helen Marie	Yes
11019	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dreger, Karen	Yes
11020	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stewart, Raymond	Yes
11021	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fiedler, David	Yes
11022	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jacobs, Sally	Yes
11023	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Jennifer	Yes
11024	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11025	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mortensen, John A	Yes
11026	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mattice, Margaret R	Yes
11027	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schutz, Arlene	Yes
11028	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Killips, Bruce D	Yes
11029	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McLane, Richard	No
11030	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		keen, jim	No
11031	5/8/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		mendelson, ruth	Yes
11032	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mortensen, John A	No
11033	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blume, Gerald	No
11034	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Byron, Sharon	No
11035	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Brantley, Jane S	Yes
11036	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eagle, Diane	No
11037	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scholl, Barbara Sue	Yes
11038	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11039	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Atkins, Amy	No
11040	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Henckel, Judy	Yes
11041	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	TAYLOR, DELIA	Yes
11042	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Woodyard, Sherry	Yes
11043	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Solomon, William	Yes
11044	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kilmer, Martin	Yes
11045	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reinaker, Rebecca	Yes
11046	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Murray, Michael	Yes
11047	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kent, Jean	Yes
11048	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	D. Turner, Jane	Yes
11049	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Seghetti, Kathleen	Yes
11050	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Colleen	Yes
11051	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dorang, Louis	Yes
11052	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shalat, Harriet	Yes

0008696

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11053	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WARD, MARTIN	Yes
11054	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Lynch, Jaremy P	No
11055	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Campbell, Allan L	No
11056	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stevenson, Craig	Yes
11057	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11058	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Waterworth, Pamela D	No
11059	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation	Eyer, Diane	No
11060	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardison, James A	Yes
11061	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kerr, S.	No
11062	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wemmer, Ken	No
11063	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Gorringe, Ph. D., Richard	Yes
11064	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assn	Johnston, MaryAnn C	Yes
11065	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Service	Bryan, Tim R	Yes
11066	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peariso, Sharon	Yes
11067	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Service	Bryan, Lori A	Yes
11068	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harwood, Amanda	Yes
11069	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kleymeyer, C	Yes
11070	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Patrick, Michael	Yes
11071	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Irving, Sherri	Yes
11072	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holt, Margaret	Yes
11073	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jaeger, Robert	Yes
11074	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Mary	Yes
11075	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beckett, Anne	Yes
11076	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boehme, Louise	Yes
11077	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kethler, dorothy	Yes
11078	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Emilia, Emilia	Yes
11079	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	garcia, dawn	Yes
11080	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		HODIE, JAKE	Yes
11081	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dillon, Christopher N	No
11082	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Unger, Pamela M	Yes
11083	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stibitz, Susan H	Yes
11084	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	AFL	Seaman, Gerda	No
11085	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Metzler, Douglas	No
11086	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Strickland, Jennifer	No
11087	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cohn, Sidney	Yes
11088	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Vergin, Cheryl K	Yes
11089	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11090	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRDC	BELMONT, CHARLES F	No
11091	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Leaf, Elizabeth A	No
11092	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11093	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11094	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Powell, Margaret	Yes
11095	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hodge, Mary	Yes
11096	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Welton, John	Yes
11097	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brindley, John	Yes
11098	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Heanue, Muriel	Yes
11099	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Arnholt, Paige	Yes
11100	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wiesman, Janet	Yes
11101	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Michaels, Dana	Yes
11102	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schiess, Joan	Yes
11103	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Knoll, Carolyn	No
11104	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11105	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mattingly, J. R.	No
11106	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		CONLON, ANN D	No
11107	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stewart, Sarah B	Yes

0008697

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11108	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11109	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WILLIAMS, ANGIE L	No
11110	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc.	Sawyer, Jerry	No
11111	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Greenwell, Theresina M	No
11112	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stewart, Tracy	No
11113	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11114	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11115	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schuess, Joan	No
11116	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Teasley, Regi	No
11117	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Davis, Kathleen	No
11118	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Hughes, Kelli	No
11119	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Daedra D	Yes
11120	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Snitzer, Eileen	No
11121	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Tucker-Dolan, Patricia E	Yes
11122	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McKay, Nelle	Yes
11123	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Autrey-Schell, Yovonne D	No
11124	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	SELF	KNOWLES, LYNDA H	Yes
11125	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11126	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		montani, raymond	No
11127	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Association	Anderson, Leonora	No
11128	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mollett, John B	Yes
11129	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schreer, Kelly	No
11130	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Montani, Patricia	No
11131	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Turner, Jeffrey A	No
11132	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mascelli, Mary	Yes
11133	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	moorehead, susan	Yes
11134	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilley, Jane	Yes
11135	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walker, Lynn	Yes
11136	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vantalon, Serge	Yes
11137	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pearl, sylvia	Yes
11138	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maddalena, Barb	Yes
11139	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	whitepaws, kemosabe	Yes
11140	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Steen, Lauren	Yes
11141	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lengel, Megan	Yes
11142	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WARSTLER, PAT E	No
11143	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Esposito, Thomas and June	No
11144	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Education Association	George, Troy J	Yes
11145	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11146	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Reisman, Rita	Yes
11147	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		MacPhail, Chad D	Yes
11148	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ludwig, Mary Jane	No
11149	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Trammell, Menlia M	No
11150	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Royer, Josh	No
11151	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11152	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11153	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keen, Diana M	No
11154	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		jackson, richard	No
11155	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Modjeski, Jan	No
11156	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sklensky, Diane E	Yes
11157	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holmgren, Mark G	Yes
11158	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyson, Valerie M	No

0008698

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11159	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Morgan, Judith	Yes
11160	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11161	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walker, George	Yes
11162	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Willis, Jennifer	Yes
11163	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vogelsang, Judith	Yes
11164	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Conservation Assoc.	Bolten, Virginia L	No
11165	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McCarthy, Debbie	Yes
11166	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKimmie, Tim	No
11167	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Protect Wildlife	strahan, sandra G	No
11168	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sparber, Marc	No
11169	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McConoughey, Tamra M	Yes
11170	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kisor, Dave	No
11171	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Landau, Doug	Yes
11172	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Edwina R	Yes
11173	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Slattery, Leda L	Yes
11174	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRDC	Barrie, Lori	No
11175	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Buhler, Melissa K	No
11176	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Byrd, Beth	Yes
11177	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks	Ramsay, Art	Yes
11178	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Leaf, Joan	No
11179	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	audubon	petrak, thanice	Yes
11180	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kemple, Jason	No
11181	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hurst Payne, Lesley	Yes
11182	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leaf, Joan	Yes
11183	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Richards, Mary	Yes
11184	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Somers, Jeff	Yes
11185	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Call, Barbara	Yes
11186	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shelton, Gloria	Yes
11187	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Webb, Kendrick C	No
11188	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schafer, Robert H	No
11189	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		shevis, aron	No
11190	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Visscher, William A	No
11191	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	University of Oregon	Slawson, Wayne	Yes
11192	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	our developiing world	Ulmer, Vic and Barby	Yes
11193	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelly, Ann M	Yes
11194	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Luft, Muriel M	Yes
11195	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	McCausland, Christopher J	No
11196	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schermer, Linda	No
11197	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Canine Recreation Coalition	LaCognata, Dale	No
11198	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blair, J S	Yes
11199	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc.	Smith, Pamela	Yes
11200	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife.	cost, eowyn	No
11201	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perkins, Richard	Yes
11202	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		White, Michael W	Yes
11203	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Blair, J A	Yes
11204	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cendejas, Lilly	Yes
11205	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Trice, Thomas L	No
11206	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kohan, Freda P	Yes
11207	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McCullough, Justin S	No
11208	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chapple, Evelyn	Yes
11209	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kagle, Georgia	Yes
11210	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeGroot, Judith	Yes
11211	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rogers, Michael	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11212	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Conger, Ann	Yes
11213	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Berliner, Diane	Yes
11214	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Levey, Mary	Yes
11215	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hollister, Richard	Yes
11216	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hagens, Jennifer	Yes
11217	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDonald, Caroline	Yes
11218	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	moore, s	Yes
11219	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moore, April	Yes
11220	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cragg, Gordon	Yes
11221	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Seffinga, Sarah	Yes
11222	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eagle, Nee	Yes
11223	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Raymond, Janice	Yes
11224	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cubeta, Katie	Yes
11225	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schafer, Robert H	No
11226	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Brown, Lorraine V	Yes
11227	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Duncan, Pat and Gary	Yes
11228	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11229	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCS	N/A, N/A	No
11230	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		tryles, gael f	No
11231	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CDC/CCID/CPDCID	Combs, Debi	No
11232	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Weld, Robert B	No
11233	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		PALFY, T	Yes
11234	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Anderson, Vicki	No
11235	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		keith, jl	Yes
11236	5/8/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Orange County Land Trust	Lange, Marlena F	No
11237	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11238	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Danner, Jennifer	Yes
11239	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		harman, chris	No
11240	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clark, Lucy	Yes
11241	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	King, Jane	Yes
11242	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	wescoat, ruby	Yes
11243	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Scott, Edward	Yes
11244	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meese, Gail	Yes
11245	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Lowell	Yes
11246	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Lorraine	Yes
11247	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		poppe, donnal p	Yes
11248	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Long, Jennie	Yes
11249	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harlowe, William W	Yes
11250	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Montgomery, Rose	No
11251	5/8/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Carol	No
11252	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Crawford, Susan	Yes
11253	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Julia	No
11254	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Powell, James S	No
11255	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reynolds, Patricia C	Yes
11256	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Babbe, Wendy	Yes
11257	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kindel, Karen	No
11258	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11259	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		sanders, judith k	No
11260	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11261	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Prichard, Pam	Yes
11262	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rosenbaum, Steven B	No
11263	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Blue Energy Corporation	Vesperman, Gary C	No
11264	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mihalko-mueller, judith	Yes
11265	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Juozunas, Laura	Yes
11266	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Freishtat, Sheryl	Yes
11267	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Everdale, W Ginevra	Yes

0008700

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11268	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Menard, Brenda	Yes
11269	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nieman, Cathy	Yes
11270	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dillon, Christi	Yes
11271	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gray, Mary-Ann	Yes
11272	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ramsey, Mary Anne	Yes
11273	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		malone, james	No
11274	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rotcher, Michael I	No
11275	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	npca	brownrigg, sarah a	Yes
11276	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bonk, Vicki J	Yes
11277	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Abbott, Michelle	Yes
11278	5/8/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nt'l Parks Conserv. Assoc.	Casier, Karen	Yes
11279	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gibbons, Brian T	No
11280	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Muir, Marybeth	No
11281	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	sierra club	Scott, Celia	Yes
11282	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Craig, Donna M	No
11283	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rose, Kelli	Yes
11284	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SUKUMAR, N.	Yes
11285	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hodgdon, Roberta	Yes
11286	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jamison, Michele	Yes
11287	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Edith	Yes
11288	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Phelps, James	Yes
11289	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cole, Crystal	Yes
11290	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	hunter, jack	Yes
11291	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Utan, Kathryn	Yes
11292	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Eppstein, Nicole	No
11293	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Sarcone, Mark A	Yes
11294	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sprenkle, Richard G	No
11295	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11296	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Eberhardt, Steven R	Yes
11297	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sims, Susan S	No
11298	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Collins, Raymond T	No
11299	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		SINDELAR, GEO	No
11300	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11301	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sikes, Mary	Yes
11302	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	member	Heide, Andra	Yes
11303	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leach, Sydney K	No
11304	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McIntosh, Judy	Yes
11305	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sepenoski, John	Yes
11306	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Libbey, Donna	Yes
11307	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thomas, Patricia	Yes
11308	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rider, Nicole	Yes
11309	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Penaherrera, Roberto	Yes
11310	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bratton, Elliot	Yes
11311	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Eberwein, Victoria	Yes
11312	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarce, Sandy	Yes
11313	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11314	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Wreck Pond Watershed Assoc	Maclearie, Nancy A	No
11315	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leach, Kelley A	No
11316	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hildebrandt, Andrea M	No
11317	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ruckdeschel, Katy	Yes
11318	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Allan, Claire	No
11319	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Luecke, David	No
11320	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Entley, Hilary	No
11321	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Donahue, Pam S	Yes

0008701

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11322	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Provencher, Lauri	No
11323	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Locker, Jack	Yes
11324	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, Jan	No
11325	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gorn, Lisa	Yes
11326	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Christopherson, Martin	Yes
11327	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	krause, susan	Yes
11328	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewin, Philip	Yes
11329	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bernheimer, Julie	Yes
11330	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rothen, Jill	Yes
11331	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Anderson, Adolphus	Yes
11332	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Daasyaananda, Swami	Yes
11333	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	White, Jessica	Yes
11334	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schwartz, Donald	Yes
11335	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kjono, Pamela	No
11336	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Conservation Association	Wilson, Nathan	No
11337	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stern, Les H	Yes
11338	5/8/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	South Florida Audubon Society	Campbell, Grant	No
11339	5/8/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		Minor, Shannon	No
11340	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Aircraft Owners and Pilots Assoc	Apenis, Robert	Yes
11341	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11342	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McCall, Charles	No
11343	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Butcher, Ava J	Yes
11344	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Campbell, Karolyn K	No
11345	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation	Solomon, Rita D	Yes
11346	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11347	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Turak, Jessica T	No
11348	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Musick, Ronald A	No
11349	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rainbrook, Judith	Yes
11350	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		malkerson, joel w	Yes
11351	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fairchild, Stephanie	No
11352	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carlino, Thomas	Yes
11353	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Barbara	No
11354	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reider, Carolyn	Yes
11355	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lyons, david	Yes
11356	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Breckenridge, Bonnie	Yes
11357	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Palmquist, Hester	Yes
11358	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Don	Yes
11359	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rispoli, Laurie Lago	Yes
11360	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maida, Gregory	Yes
11361	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Litster, Kimberly	Yes
11362	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cawfield, Alicia	Yes
11363	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bromer, Ruth	Yes
11364	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weinblatt, Victoria	Yes
11365	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Connell, Killian	Yes
11366	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Alspaugh, Kristen	Yes
11367	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lish, Christopher	Yes
11368	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bauer, Karen-Lynette	Yes
11369	5/8/2010	No	Recreational Groups	ikO	alvarado, carlos	No
11370	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Estes, Douglas C	Yes
11371	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hawn, Donna L	No
11372	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Garde, Vaibhav	Yes
11373	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Waltman, Martha E	No
11374	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11375	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
11376	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
11377	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11378	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11379	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
11380	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPA	Parks, Joan C	No
11381	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blythe, Linda M	No
11382	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Faulkner, Deb F	No
11383	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Roberts, Katherine G	No
11384	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
11385	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11386	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Beale, Jr., Howard K	No
11387	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nahn, Anne E	Yes
11388	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRDC, Audubon, EDF, Sierra Club, American Bird Conservancy, Wilderness Society, NWF	Hissam, Tim	Yes
11389	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Turner, George	Yes
11390	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Isham, Elbert	Yes
11391	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coleman, Shirley	Yes
11392	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Doleniak, Stephanie	Yes
11393	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gogolkiewicz, Nancy	Yes
11394	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Russell, Rebecca	Yes
11395	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vojta, Michi	Yes
11396	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Magnum, Nicolas	Yes
11397	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Artman, Thomas	Yes
11398	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Selmecci, Aileen	Yes
11399	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pollock, Amy	Yes
11400	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Michaelis, Bjoern	Yes
11401	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garrett, Shawna Lee	Yes
11402	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wyatt, Mia	Yes
11403	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clement, Jennifer P	No
11404	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Illinois Audubon Society	Cohen, Sonny	Yes
11405	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeland, Penny	No
11406	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McNeely, Lynda	Yes
11407	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		PECKNER, LLOYD M	No
11408	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11409	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Krawczyk, Richard	Yes
11410	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brittain, Raymond C	No
11411	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Yosemite Association	Blanchard, Patricia	No
11412	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Danis, Lara	Yes
11413	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11414	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Simmons, Kathleen V	No
11415	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Styron, Ernest	No
11416	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11417	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11418	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Conservation Assoc	Beckham, Ms M L	No
11419	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Foley, Erin C	No
11420	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Rae	Yes
11421	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanner, Deanna	Yes
11422	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Varner-Munt, Sheri	Yes
11423	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Roeth, Alexandra	Yes
11424	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hill, Michael	Yes
11425	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wilson, Danyelle	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11426	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Restle, Mary J	No
11427	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		klandl, scott c	Yes
11428	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Council, Norman	Yes
11429	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kremer, Jeffrey D	Yes
11430	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sprouse, Sharon	Yes
11431	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Woodall, Sandra S	No
11432	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carpenter, Susanne	No
11433	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, N/A	No
11434	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nhipali, Michele	No
11435	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		cornell, pat	Yes
11436	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Erickson, Carol J	Yes
11437	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Billmaier, Michelle G	Yes
11438	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Soriano, Harriet A	Yes
11439	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mendoza, Durango	No
11440	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burbridge, Scott A	No
11441	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Virginians For Parks	Dillard, Jim	Yes
11442	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Guerrero, Annette	Yes
11443	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	cole, cal	Yes
11444	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donnelly, Patrick	Yes
11445	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barber, Brent	Yes
11446	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carpenter, Susanne	Yes
11447	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kane, Leah	Yes
11448	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Carter, Shirlee	Yes
11449	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Padgett, Teresa	Yes
11450	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gilliland, Ron	Yes
11451	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wagner, Susan	Yes
11452	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dymek, Leah	Yes
11453	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11454	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11455	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Veit, Eberhard	No
11456	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Audubon Society	Barrett, Christine A	Yes
11457	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Irwin, Michael E	Yes
11458	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nordsven, Ryan	Yes
11459	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McNamara, Andrew	Yes
11460	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bishop, Andrew	Yes
11461	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	johnson, patty	Yes
11462	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McMahon, Elizabeth	Yes
11463	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Friend of Defenders, Amy	Yes
11464	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hunter, Aurora E	Yes
11465	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Koepf, Gail E	No
11466	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11467	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reifenstuhl, Rocky R	Yes
11468	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11469	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11470	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shugart, Marilyn E	No
11471	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fedorov, Karen L	No
11472	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Chesapeake Bay Foundation	Craig, Margaret L	Yes
11473	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Humane Society	Bergalis, Anna	Yes
11474	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, N/A	No
11475	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chess, Katie	Yes
11476	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	George, Allison	Yes
11477	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Laing, Mike	Yes
11478	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11479	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peterson, Terry	Yes
11480	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Robin	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11481	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Horning, Laura	Yes
11482	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Humphreys, John	Yes
11483	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Wood, Joyce G	Yes
11484	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sullivan, Rosa	Yes
11485	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Platzky, Franklin	Yes
11486	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	nps	ostrem, emita r	Yes
11487	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cabot, Colleen	Yes
11488	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hemstreet, Steven	No
11489	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Figuroa, Julie A	No
11490	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stearns, Geoffrey	Yes
11491	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lenaghan, Kevin	Yes
11492	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sutton, Lee	Yes
11493	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	HNS	Verdini, Alfred J	No
11494	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johanson II, Dave	No
11495	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ryersbach, Zak J	No
11496	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Van Zee, Ali	Yes
11497	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Beverly G	No
11498	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Parker, David	No
11499	5/8/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11500	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamburg, Diane L	Yes
11501	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loe, Steve	Yes
11502	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Livingston, James	Yes
11503	5/8/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reeder, James	Yes
11504	5/8/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sikes, Ginger	Yes
11505	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Barshis, Jan	Yes
11506	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11507	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pantel, Chris	Yes
11508	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kirby, Sherrie	Yes
11509	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	HICKMAN, CATHERINE	Yes
11510	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Beschler, Marc	No
11511	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Lenhardt, Peter	No
11512	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Silva, Becky	Yes
11513	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barfield, Jeanne	Yes
11514	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dixon Gumm, Penny	Yes
11515	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Judd, Ross F	No
11516	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carson, Sam	Yes
11517	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Service, Kinsey	Yes
11518	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Logue Family, The	Yes
11519	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Steitz, Mimi	Yes
11520	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wright-Campbell, Huron	Yes
11521	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lozier-Sartawi, Brooke	Yes
11522	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assn.	Tobias, Harvey A	Yes
11523	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ROZNER, JAY	No
11524	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Linsenbuehler, Susan	Yes
11525	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Loomis, Jessica	Yes
11526	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11527	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whitney, Judith	No
11528	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		LaReau, R Chris	Yes
11529	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	The Blues Brothers	Adams, III, Charles C	Yes
11530	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Actors' Equity Assn.	Cross, Alfred D	Yes
11531	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		teeuwisse, ekeim	No
11532	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, Ken	No
11533	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grisel, Judith	Yes

0008705

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11534	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dagney, Orysia	No
11535	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11536	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Humowiecki, Jennifer	No
11537	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Van Lith, Martin R	Yes
11538	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Walk, Rosalyn	Yes
11539	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wiedower, Lana	Yes
11540	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Catherine	Yes
11541	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Megibow, Robin	Yes
11542	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	AULT, JAN	Yes
11543	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Flynt, Susan	Yes
11544	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mason, Chrissy	Yes
11545	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Volk, Shelley	Yes
11546	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		DeGraaf, Rob L	Yes
11547	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Galvanek, Janel B	No
11548	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cameron, Eddie	No
11549	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Andersen, Janet S	Yes
11550	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11551	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kirchwey, Christopher	Yes
11552	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11553	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Krimmelbein, Cindy S	Yes
11554	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mathew, Brett	Yes
11555	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Allen, Virginia	Yes
11556	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lohr, Allyson	Yes
11557	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kampouris, Denise	Yes
11558	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Christmas, Robin	Yes
11559	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Grunebaum, Luiza	No
11560	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ULLIS, WILLIAM F	No
11561	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		LaCognata, Dale	No
11562	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thompson, Janis	No
11563	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11564	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Little, Godfrey L	No
11565	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lund, Karen E	Yes
11566	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11567	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chepuru, Melissa	Yes
11568	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Good, Mary Ann	Yes
11569	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Petzold, Karin	Yes
11570	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mozzati, Anna Adelaide	Yes
11571	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mrozewski, Sylvia	No
11572	5/9/2010	Yes (436720)	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Connell, Mike	Yes
11573	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11574	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Clemo, Peter	Yes
11575	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11576	5/9/2010	Yes (435444)	Unaffiliated Individual		FAZIO, PHILLIP	No
11577	5/9/2010	Yes (435444)	Unaffiliated Individual		FAZIO, CLAIRE A	No
11578	5/9/2010	Yes (435444)	Unaffiliated Individual		FAZIO, NICK A	No
11579	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	MEMBER	BAEZ, CRISTINA	Yes
11580	5/9/2010	Yes (435444)	Unaffiliated Individual		FAZIO, ALANA	No
11581	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pardaise, Brian G	No
11582	5/9/2010	Yes (435444)	Unaffiliated Individual		FAZIO, NINA	No
11583	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA, NCBBA	TOMBERLIN, SUSAN R	Yes
11584	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11585	5/9/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	TOMBERLIN, JACOB D	Yes
11586	5/9/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA, OBPA	TOMBERLIN, GERALD D	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11587	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11588	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		moski, alison	No
11589	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lange, Marlena	Yes
11590	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Arnold, Michelle	Yes
11591	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Moschopoulos, Charity	Yes
11592	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11593	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	shoemaker, fred	Yes
11594	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Parrish, Susan E	Yes
11595	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11596	5/9/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Farber, Brent	Yes
11597	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Lubon, Janet K	Yes
11598	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Maglione, Jude	Yes
11599	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilson, Sharon L	No
11600	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Zivney, Olivia A	No
11601	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Raab, Dr. Gerald F	Yes
11602	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beck, Rosemary	Yes
11603	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Manrodt, Kate	Yes
11604	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Connor, Sarah	Yes
11605	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kerns, Dr Michael-David	No
11606	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		BENNETT, DONALD R	No
11607	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooper, Victoria L	Yes
11608	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Selbin, Susan /	Yes
11609	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brennan, Laura	No
11610	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rush, Nan M	Yes
11611	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		streicker, susanne k	Yes
11612	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tenda, Jennifer	Yes
11613	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	White, Jr., William	Yes
11614	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	chaffee, thomas	Yes
11615	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Maglione, Judith	Yes
11616	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kasim, Arshad	Yes
11617	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Abell, Martha B	No
11618	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grice, John W	Yes
11619	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11620	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11621	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swartz, Dolores	No
11622	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mayfield-Chapin, Rev. Shannon	Yes
11623	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11624	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		t, c	Yes
11625	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11626	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA, CHAC, CONSERVATION ASSOC, OBPA, RWS Civic Assoc	Dimig, John	No
11627	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hamilton, Cathy	Yes
11628	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wilkinson, amelia	Yes
11629	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barr, David	Yes
11630	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Atkins, Linda	Yes
11631	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bloom, Emily	Yes
11632	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Swing, Carol	Yes
11633	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Heath, Gail	Yes
11634	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schmotzer, Michael S	No
11635	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blackwood, Ashley L	Yes
11636	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	N/A, N/A	Yes

0008707

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11637	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blount, Jason T	Yes
11638	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CHAC	Cullen, Lawrence D	Yes
11639	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Boyd, P.W.	No
11640	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		waterbury, irving b	Yes
11641	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	League of Woman Voters	Clayman, Janet	Yes
11642	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Engelhardt, Erika	Yes
11643	5/9/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Palmer, Rod	No
11644	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	welton, Thomas	Yes
11645	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGinnis, Jenni	Yes
11646	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Panullo, Sarah	Yes
11647	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11648	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Edie	No
11649	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gillespie, Summer	Yes
11650	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Levas, Eftychia	Yes
11651	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Turner, Dawn	Yes
11652	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Riddle, Irene b	Yes
11653	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blum, Bruce I	Yes
11654	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Biscoe, Thomas	Yes
11655	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hussey, Mark R	No
11656	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelly, James	No
11657	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Jergovic, Nicole M	Yes
11658	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cullen, Helle K	No
11659	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Simpson, Lizbeth G	Yes
11660	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lane, Patricia A	Yes
11661	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hesse, Benjamin P	No
11662	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Koenig, Brent	No
11663	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Freidhof, Zach	No
11664	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11665	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Harper, Kate	No
11666	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dainotto, John	No
11667	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fehrman, Jenni	Yes
11668	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Home	Olson, Susan	No
11669	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stefenson, Hope	Yes
11670	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yogarathnam, Ingrid	Yes
11671	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lawrence, Patricia	Yes
11672	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Muller-O'Gorman, Kathleen	Yes
11673	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11674	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dente, Ann	Yes
11675	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Deal, McKenna	Yes
11676	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dominguez, Laura	Yes
11677	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	MacFarland, Charles	Yes
11678	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bautista, Mary P	Yes
11679	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kandrach, Lawrence E	Yes
11680	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cowsert, Michael W	No
11681	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wolan-Jedziniak, Lila	No
11682	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bishop, Norman A	No
11683	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Yates, Shirley r	No
11684	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walder, E Gail	Yes
11685	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Home Run Realty Investments	Bounds, Michael R	No
11686	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nature Conservancy	Davies, James G	No
11687	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association, Sierra Club, Nature Conservancy and others	Bratton, Teresa S	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11688	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rowley, Karen	No
11689	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		vrecenak, jay k	No
11690	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11691	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lattanzio, Anthony	Yes
11692	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		MacDonald, William P	Yes
11693	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bishop, Lynn	No
11694	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sederberg, Karyn C	No
11695	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Smith, Kenneth	No
11696	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		deTreville, Christopher L	Yes
11697	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Beichler, Scott	Yes
11698	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Flengas, Maria	Yes
11699	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ringwelski, Vicki	Yes
11700	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Coulter, Becky G	No
11701	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hentschel, Nicholas I	No
11702	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11703	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McClellan, M.S. Natural Resources, Ingrid C	Yes
11704	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Newbern, Peter	No
11705	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ewing, Ann	No
11706	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ward, Brandon M	Yes
11707	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yingling, Tom and Barg	Yes
11708	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Devlin, Felicity	No
11709	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Koons, George	No
11710	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hall Phillips, Sara	Yes
11711	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Donald	No
11712	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Staples, James	Yes
11713	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fabian, Dagmar	No
11714	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Guzynski, Elizabeth	Yes
11715	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bob, Renate	No
11716	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peariso, Katrina	Yes
11717	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Warman-Szvoboda, Gaerin	Yes
11718	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wilson, Karen	Yes
11719	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fieldhammer, Keith	Yes
11720	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Paul, Philippe	Yes
11721	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barger, Rosemary	Yes
11722	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Naiman, Shoshanah	Yes
11723	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Polanco, Sandra	Yes
11724	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Fox Watersports	James, Freddy	No
11725	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11726	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rigsby, Jr. DVM, Robert C	No
11727	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ash, Kahty	Yes
11728	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Chwalisz, Bart	No
11729	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		wright, kim	Yes
11730	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, Margaret	Yes
11731	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Palmer, Rod	No
11732	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11733	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		fazzari, angela f	No
11734	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hingtgen, Robert	No
11735	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	H.M.S Enterprises	Smith, Hal M	Yes
11736	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Brad	Yes
11737	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sweet, Justin	No
11738	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buczynski, Stephen	Yes
11739	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jarratt, Heidi	Yes
11740	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Guild, Jessica	Yes

0008709

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11741	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jones, Michael	Yes
11742	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		garcia, reginald	No
11743	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Frame, George W	No
11744	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11745	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11746	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11747	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11748	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Casey, Thomas	No
11749	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11750	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zurcher, Naomi	No
11751	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Diana, Hall	Yes
11752	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lieberman, Sharon F	No
11753	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reynolds, Patricia C	Yes
11754	5/9/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Snedeker, jan T	No
11755	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilkinson, Patricia	No
11756	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	member	Swanson, Fred	Yes
11757	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11758	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc	Sarin, Charles H	No
11759	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore & Curry, Sharon & Steve	Yes
11760	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, RN, Nancy	Yes
11761	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hubbell, Tamara	Yes
11762	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sletteland, Holly	Yes
11763	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Herbert, John E	Yes
11764	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	White, Cynthia	Yes
11765	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Russell, Wilson	Yes
11766	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Redding, Jane	Yes
11767	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Good, John S.	Yes
11768	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holtz, Barbara	Yes
11769	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Moor, Judy	No
11770	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Butscher, Alicia K	Yes
11771	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Flanigan, David G	Yes
11772	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bonta, Marcia M	No
11773	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Martinson, Lauren G	Yes
11774	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Denise	No
11775	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grant, June	No
11776	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dellinger, Robert	No
11777	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		lafond, david j	No
11778	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11779	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Adams, Larry S	Yes
11780	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		THORNE, JACK L	Yes
11781	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ashby, L	No
11782	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Soper, Jeanine	Yes
11783	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burkey, Tanya	No
11784	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, John R	No
11785	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harbeson, Chrlotte	Yes
11786	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Muzzarelli, Eileene	Yes
11787	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	fabiano, r.	Yes
11788	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whiteside, SC	Yes
11789	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Washburn, Denise	Yes
11790	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Jessica	Yes
11791	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Blackford, Reanna	Yes
11792	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carroll, Alita R	No

0008710

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11793	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11794	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cote, Don	No
11795	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wager, Kristen	No
11796	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Atonement Lutheran Church	Schreiber, Edward	No
11797	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation	Brown, Cynthia M	Yes
11798	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Private citizen	Martinez, Marta L	Yes
11799	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scully, Richard T	Yes
11800	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Huq, Marian	Yes
11801	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edwards, Elise	Yes
11802	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tripp, Wesley	Yes
11803	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aiken, Edwin	Yes
11804	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rainey, Peggy	Yes
11805	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gibbons, Brian	Yes
11806	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Good, Denise M.	Yes
11807	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Setchel, Janet	Yes
11808	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Framer, William E	No
11809	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11810	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bishop, William	No
11811	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Weisz, Russell B	No
11812	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks conservation organization	Hunter, Linda S	Yes
11813	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Michalska, Gerri	Yes
11814	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wright, Susan L	Yes
11815	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Martin, Mallory	Yes
11816	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Schwegmann, Annette	No
11817	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Moreira, Nancy	No
11818	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11819	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lotreck, Dale P	No
11820	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Graham, Dennis	Yes
11821	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11822	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Skoog, Kay	Yes
11823	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Marie	Yes
11824	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mitchell, Kristy	Yes
11825	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11826	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Copulsky, Steve	No
11827	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11828	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hilliard, Landon	No
11829	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11830	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Ingram, Geri B	Yes
11831	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loree, Joe	Yes
11832	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Judy E	No
11833	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	national park service	herpich, patricia l	Yes
11834	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cappelletti, Regina	No
11835	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Karson, Sharon A	Yes
11836	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Skidmore, Michael	Yes
11837	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hargraves, Missy	No
11838	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11839	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ferrell, rebecca	Yes
11840	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Waugh, Charles	Yes
11841	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gibbons, Brian	Yes
11842	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Howes, Robert	Yes
11843	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Nancy	Yes
11844	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rand, Marcia	Yes
11845	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Webster, Caitlin	Yes

0008711

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11846	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sparks, Sarah Jean	Yes
11847	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NJPA	WOLF, SUSAN	Yes
11848	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Park Service	Matthaeus, Elke	Yes
11849	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	University of Missouri- Environmental Sciences	Gorham, Adam K	Yes
11850	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Watson, Bruce	Yes
11851	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11852	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nichols, Fonda W	No
11853	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Strand, Theodore E	Yes
11854	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mehrotra, Siddharth	No
11855	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kripli, Paul	No
11856	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Butcher, Joan r	No
11857	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11858	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cain, Thomas A	No
11859	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harding, Steve	Yes
11860	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oleyar, Maureen	Yes
11861	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zuckerman, Michael	Yes
11862	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ams, David	Yes
11863	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tedore, Cynthia	Yes
11864	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kripli, Paul	Yes
11865	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Whiteheart, Lisa	Yes
11866	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Greene, Kimberly	Yes
11867	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Debellis, Michael	Yes
11868	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Arnold, Cynthia	Yes
11869	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Spencer, Elizabeth	Yes
11870	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Simpkins, Heather	Yes
11871	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooper, S T	Yes
11872	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pangborn, Della L	Yes
11873	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lawrence, Paul S	No
11874	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGinty, Alison E	Yes
11875	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Scanlon, Kelley	Yes
11876	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rodgers, Penny s	Yes
11877	5/9/2010	Yes (435340)	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA and NCBBA	Allen, Glen	No
11878	5/9/2010	Yes (435340)	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Paige	Yes
11879	5/9/2010	Master (435340)	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Chelsey	No
11880	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Wendy	Yes
11881	5/9/2010	Yes (435340)	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Meredith	No
11882	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Wert, Katharine K	No
11883	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Robertson , Myles	No
11884	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Cynthia L	Yes
11885	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Cotter, Robert	Yes
11886	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Benson, John	No
11887	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duke, Jessica	Yes
11888	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kraus, Jean	Yes
11889	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Heida, Kelsey	Yes
11890	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dimiceli, Lisa	Yes
11891	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Howard-Levy, Alison	Yes
11892	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hutchinson, James H	No
11893	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cole, Beth L	No
11894	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Adams, Barb	No
11895	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11896	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Derreumaux, Tiffaney A	Yes
11897	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rodgers, Jerry R	Yes
11898	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Alden, John W	No
11899	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bodiford, Loretta	Yes

0008712

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11900	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Conlon, Suzanne	Yes
11901	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gould, Burnham	Yes
11902	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cole, Beth	Yes
11903	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Westervelt, Frederic B	No
11904	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11905	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lunt, Tracy	Yes
11906	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Erickson, Kathleen	Yes
11907	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Garrett, M	Yes
11908	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thornton, Nancy	Yes
11909	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pappert, Linda	Yes
11910	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Martin, Elisabeth	Yes
11911	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wilson, Carolyn Q.	Yes
11912	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Yurik, Joanne	Yes
11913	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CITIZEN	hinson,iii, william c	No
11914	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chepko, Gloria	No
11915	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11916	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brooker, Sayde	No
11917	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Osborne, Miri	Yes
11918	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carroll, Dennis L	Yes
11919	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leh, Robert L	Yes
11920	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harris, Ietha	Yes
11921	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Drayson, Sloane	Yes
11922	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clausen, Nancy	Yes
11923	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Naifeh, Karen	Yes
11924	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sullivan, Susan	Yes
11925	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nottingham, Sara	Yes
11926	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Chepko, Gloria	Yes
11927	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Abadia, Edgard	Yes
11928	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Keddell, Sarah	Yes
11929	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Daniel, Dottie M	Yes
11930	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Swink, Josh	No
11931	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
11932	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoke, Dee	No
11933	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johns, Robert B	Yes
11934	5/9/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reese, Franklin E	No
11935	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rozum, Sandra	Yes
11936	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pasqua, john	Yes
11937	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Layne, Linda	Yes
11938	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pritchett, Daniel	Yes
11939	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Malott, Jessica	Yes
11940	5/9/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reese, Barbara W	No
11941	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jelinek, Alexander J	Yes
11942	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Dean	No
11943	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Dean	No
11944	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rozum, Dennis	Yes
11945	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		neidell, m	No
11946	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hametz, Marilyn	Yes
11947	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holmes, Matthew	Yes
11948	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Deters, Gwen	Yes
11949	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Man-O-War Kiteboard	Dorval, Félix-Antoine A	Yes
11950	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Koller, Suzanne	Yes
11951	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Slack, Debra	Yes
11952	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Albright, Lisa	Yes
11953	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gollub, Frank	Yes
11954	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tomechko, Sydney	Yes
11955	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cupp, Judy	Yes

0008713

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
11956	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mulholland, Marion	Yes
11957	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lee, Michelle	Yes
11958	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Farmer, Dana T	Yes
11959	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Casaday, Garth	Yes
11960	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schilling, Francis X	Yes
11961	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCarthy, Maureen	No
11962	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Leback, Warren T	Yes
11963	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	N/A, N/A	No
11964	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11965	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Neil, Jenny	Yes
11966	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spector, Susan	Yes
11967	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tait, Pauline	Yes
11968	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dowling, David	Yes
11969	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mitcheson, John	Yes
11970	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brimm, Martha	Yes
11971	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Smith, Melinda	Yes
11972	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Godbey, Vivian	Yes
11973	5/9/2010	Master (435444)	Unaffiliated Individual		FAZIO, ANTHONY	No
11974	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thompson, Thelma D	No
11975	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ward, L M	No
11976	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Envirosapes Design	Hanratty, Kathryn	No
11977	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Larson, Laura D	No
11978	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilkinson, Keith	No
11979	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Eagle Physicians	Westermann, Carola	Yes
11980	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Snow, Joel F	Yes
11981	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelly, Sharon S	Yes
11982	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Luong, Tuan	Yes
11983	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kytchak, david	Yes
11984	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeCicco, Richard	Yes
11985	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
11986	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barker, Linda	Yes
11987	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Honeyman, Brittany	Yes
11988	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pusel, Joyce	Yes
11989	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nicholson, Ashley	Yes
11990	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Galante, Susan	Yes
11991	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stottlemeyer, Karl	Yes
11992	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Beverly J	Yes
11993	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		jacobson, ellen Sue	Yes
11994	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Murphy, M	Yes
11995	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clarke, Karen M	Yes
11996	5/9/2010	No	Non-Governmental	The Living Cosmos Society	Pasichnyk, Richard	No
11997	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		schmidt, linda	Yes
11998	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thorne, Art	No
11999	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Connell, Art	Yes
12000	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12001	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Kelly	No
12002	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12003	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12004	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Haller, William C	No
12005	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Curd, Denise	No
12006	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pilus, Tamara	Yes
12007	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, John A	Yes
12008	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Helfman, Laura	No
12009	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Green, Eric	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12010	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hagemann, Fran	No
12011	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		hagemann, kenneth c	No
12012	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koontz, Dorothy	Yes
12013	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Paul, Gabriele	Yes
12014	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Olszewski, Richard	Yes
12015	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Piercy, Donna	Yes
12016	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hinderstein, Karen	Yes
12017	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sutton, Eleanor	Yes
12018	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	bryn, john	Yes
12019	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mueller, Nancy	Yes
12020	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Thomas, Rhonda	Yes
12021	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kirkman, Samantha	Yes
12022	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wee, Brian	Yes
12023	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Artemis, Diana	Yes
12024	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bartolomeo, Kathleen	Yes
12025	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Barbour, Teresa	Yes
12026	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oliver, Jerry	No
12027	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Boyer, Alyson L	No
12028	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	,	No
12029	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12030	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	sierra club	witmer, chris	No
12031	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mylott, Sharon J	No
12032	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mastin-Kamps, Janice	No
12033	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12034	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12035	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Plant, Kathy J	Yes
12036	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12037	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Quay, Robert D	Yes
12038	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ramos, Joann	Yes
12039	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tillinghast, Audrey	Yes
12040	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Conway, S.	Yes
12041	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Phillips, Todd	Yes
12042	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harbin, Mike	Yes
12043	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Nordsven, Ryan	Yes
12044	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12045	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shelton, Angela F	No
12046	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gaunce, Tony	Yes
12047	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Sue E	No
12048	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12049	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rasche, Brian	Yes
12050	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Messenger, Thomas	No
12051	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lie, Kenneth G	Yes
12052	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ross, Kimra Y	No
12053	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12054	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	wooton, michele	Yes
12055	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sartoris, Elaine and John	Yes
12056	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fay, Mieke	Yes
12057	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Brown, Malcolm	Yes
12058	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Funk, Cynthia	Yes
12059	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Treen, Tracy	Yes
12060	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Campbell, Lynn	Yes
12061	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cromartie, Margaret	Yes
12062	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	K, Ann	Yes
12063	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Savage, Dorothy	No
12064	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Conservation Assoc	Menkes, B	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12065	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA, OBPA	Zubal, Darlene	Yes
12066	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewton, David G	No
12067	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Somers, Jeff D	Yes
12068	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Black, Pauline J	No
12069	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		gay, kelly d	No
12070	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Christi	No
12071	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Waller, Sheryl	No
12072	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moore, Keith	No
12073	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Escobedo, Brook	Yes
12074	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Dede	Yes
12075	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	self	Ares, Michael	Yes
12076	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schreter, Carol	Yes
12077	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Overstreet, Annette	Yes
12078	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Tracy, Don	Yes
12079	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Shiffer, Gregory	Yes
12080	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		nichols, william	No
12081	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hayhurst, Evelyn A	Yes
12082	5/9/2010	Yes (436720)	Unaffiliated Individual		O'connell, Kathleen A	Yes
12083	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Laura B	Yes
12084	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Melican, Karen	Yes
12085	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Piuhl, Stacy	No
12086	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McIntyre, Micah	Yes
12087	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carman, Glenn	Yes
12088	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		moyer, marcy	No
12089	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McArthur , Steve D	Yes
12090	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Worthley, Cynthia K	No
12091	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Ann	Yes
12092	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harber, Lucy	Yes
12093	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gore, Jesse L	No
12094	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Potavin, Andrew	Yes
12095	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Haner, Annemarie	Yes
12096	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Irvin, Yvonne	Yes
12097	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Vincent-Pope, Patrick	Yes
12098	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Sawdon, Rosemarie	Yes
12099	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Schilder, Eleanor	Yes
12100	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parker, Laura B	Yes
12101	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCulloch, Keith	No
12102	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Louwagie, Toni M	Yes
12103	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Malin, Kristin	Yes
12104	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lane, Larry	No
12105	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Heath, Matthew H	Yes
12106	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Salazar, Joe	No
12107	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gover, Pat and Gary	No
12108	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12109	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sebastian, Joseph	Yes
12110	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Richardson, Joshua	Yes
12111	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Rawls, Charles	Yes
12112	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Peterson, Irvin	Yes
12113	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Major, Roy F	No
12114	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Smith, Sharon D	No
12115	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kruschwitz, Vicki	Yes
12116	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keenan, William D	No
12117	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Janer Carper	No
12118	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Pinkus, Walter H	No
12119	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Armstrong, John	No

0008716

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12120	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Condo Renter	Garloch, Jason	No
12121	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Jenny	Yes
12122	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burkhart, Jens	Yes
12123	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Persons, Charlotte	Yes
12124	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Monson, Todd	No
12125	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Roemer, Megan	No
12126	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Roth, David	No
12127	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Goetz, Kate G	No
12128	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Abel, Jerian	No
12129	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burch, Paul	No
12130	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Garvey, Lydia	No
12131	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ritter, Liz	Yes
12132	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Halkes, Margret k	Yes
12133	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bertelsen-James, Jan	Yes
12134	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Fortin, Lily	Yes
12135	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Churchill, David	Yes
12136	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Council, Ashley	Yes
12137	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Jackson, Geigh	Yes
12138	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barthel, Carolyn C	Yes
12139	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rosen, Frederick M	Yes
12140	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Cupples, Amy P	No
12141	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Belsha, Joseph	Yes
12142	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moos, Deborah	Yes
12143	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Why, Adena	Yes
12144	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Bob	No
12145	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Browne, Sharon	Yes
12146	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Allen, Lisa L	Yes
12147	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Drescher, Gary W	Yes
12148	5/9/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12149	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Rachel F	Yes
12150	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Russell, Laura M	No
12151	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Carey, Valerie B	Yes
12152	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Horne, Jenifer	No
12153	5/9/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	norton, betty	Yes
12154	5/9/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zippert, Beth	Yes
12155	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	member	Jared, Keely A	Yes
12156	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12157	5/9/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12158	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRDC	Rekdal, Sheila K	No
12159	5/10/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12160	5/10/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12161	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilbson, James	Yes
12162	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Alvarez, Vincent M	No
12163	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weisz, Russell	Yes
12164	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kupper, Teri	Yes
12165	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Slaughter, Noel	Yes
12166	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	The National Parks Conservation Association	Daly, Charles	No
12167	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Jaime, Tina	Yes
12168	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, William R	No
12169	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	arteaga, siria	Yes
12170	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Meara, John	Yes
12171	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Munene, Vivian	Yes

0008717

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12172	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lewis, Amy	Yes
12173	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hartman, Randall E	Yes
12174	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hernandez, Sonia	Yes
12175	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	general public	King, Dennis J	Yes
12176	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kurtz, David S	Yes
12177	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Le Compte, Becky	No
12178	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12179	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Dodson, Clifford E.	Yes
12180	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, Jennifer R	No
12181	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Pilar	No
12182	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		johnson, mark e	Yes
12183	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Revilla Alguacil, Oscar	No
12184	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Judelman, Jono	No
12185	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dobranchin, Denise	Yes
12186	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	North Troendelag University College	Vikander, Nils O	Yes
12187	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		frye, mel	Yes
12188	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		cortese, lee	Yes
12189	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hallberg, Paula	Yes
12190	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Jaklitsch, Mike	No
12191	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Jimenez, Laura E	Yes
12192	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12193	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Payne, Heather	Yes
12194	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Herr, Donita	No
12195	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Toby	Yes
12196	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Singleton, Jonathon	No
12197	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weaver, Andrew C	No
12198	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Benson, John	No
12199	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Detter, Claudia I	No
12200	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamilton, Ted A	Yes
12201	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Palmer, P Barry	Yes
12202	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kamins, Jodie A	No
12203	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bell, Mary C	Yes
12204	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	O'Shell, James B	Yes
12205	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davis, Bonnie	Yes
12206	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fuhrer, Corey	Yes
12207	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Swanson, Christine	Yes
12208	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kuroda, Donna	Yes
12209	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Tellez, Liz D	Yes
12210	5/10/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Brady, Richard	No
12211	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schall, Donna R	No
12212	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, N/A	Yes
12213	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Alexander, William N	Yes
12214	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kavanagh, Joseph D	Yes
12215	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wagar, Nedra K	Yes
12216	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Winkelmeyer, Ian J	No
12217	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mindich, Karen	Yes
12218	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harvey, Frank M	Yes
12219	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12220	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chrupka, Jeremy	Yes
12221	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Held-Warmkessel, Jeanne	Yes
12222	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yarrobino, Erin	Yes
12223	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	prate, gloria	Yes

0008718

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12224	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Farmer, Bonnie	Yes
12225	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lewis, Harry	Yes
12226	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Raines, Patty	Yes
12227	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Rodney	Yes
12228	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weaver, Nanci M	Yes
12229	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12230	5/10/2010	Master (435722)	Conservation/Preservation	Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina	Ammons, Stephen R	No
12231	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NAT. PARKS ASSOC	MCELWAIN, KATHY	Yes
12232	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Botkin, gerald w	No
12233	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Herr, Kathleen	No
12234	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fursich, Rob	No
12235	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williamson Jr., Dennis H	No
12236	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer Banks Preservation Association	Wright, Samuel J	No
12237	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Jack	Yes
12238	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		skinner, edwin w	Yes
12239	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hsu, Eva	Yes
12240	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Khalepari, Sean	Yes
12241	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Bensley, Marie	Yes
12242	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Richards, Edith	Yes
12243	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Lewis, Jack	No
12244	5/10/2010	Yes (435722)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCA-NC	Austin, William E	No
12245	5/10/2010	No	Civic Groups	Durant Station Condo Assoc	Martof, Andrew B	No
12246	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Quimby, John	Yes
12247	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12248	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12249	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	May, Lana J	Yes
12250	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Quimby, John	Yes
12251	5/10/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mason, Charles L	Yes
12252	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	HOI Sierra Club	Jorgensen, Bob	Yes
12253	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dixon, David C	Yes
12254	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnett, Charlie H	No
12255	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bender, Joyce	Yes
12256	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	The Health Joint	Nieves, Sury	Yes
12257	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12258	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12259	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crowley, Rhema	Yes
12260	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Byrnes, Jooseph	Yes
12261	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ward, Barbara	Yes
12262	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aufderhar, Joan	Yes
12263	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spinelli, Mary	Yes
12264	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Anna	Yes
12265	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Baker, Rachel	Yes
12266	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Turton, Angela	Yes
12267	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Joell, Edward	Yes
12268	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Klein, Missy	Yes
12269	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Haight, Deborah	Yes
12270	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Meredith, Susan	Yes
12271	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gardener, Philip	Yes
12272	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Diederichs, Barbara E	Yes
12273	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12274	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Coughlin, Peter	No
12275	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooper, Ken D	No
12276	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Mitchell, Jacque	Yes
12277	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Latham, Judith C	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12278	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Murray, Catherine G	No
12279	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12280	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Garbrick, Kathe	No
12281	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brumleve, Charles T	Yes
12282	5/10/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12283	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cox, Brian	No
12284	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilder, jenny	No
12285	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gosselin, Christopher G	No
12286	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ashby, Stephen	No
12287	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12288	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ashby, Stephen	Yes
12289	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12290	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		CHELEWSKI, STEVE	Yes
12291	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Rogers, Thomas	Yes
12292	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nugent, Patrick	No
12293	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lifsey, Barbara	No
12294	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bartell, Michael K	Yes
12295	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ramsey, Robin	Yes
12296	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hafford, Lindsay	Yes
12297	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Husaluk, Barbara	Yes
12298	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Correia, M. Cecilia	Yes
12299	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DeVane, Max	Yes
12300	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Loftus, William	Yes
12301	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brooker, Eric	Yes
12302	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Harris, Nina	Yes
12303	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Miller, Laurie	Yes
12304	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Silvia, Lisa	Yes
12305	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Forte, James	Yes
12306	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bryant, Pat H	Yes
12307	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Russell, Susan	No
12308	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12309	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tanner, Caroline	Yes
12310	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12311	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keel, Thomas M	No
12312	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Weigel, Molly	No
12313	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McLendon, Patrick	Yes
12314	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	FINDERUP, LARS	No
12315	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Eads, Kathy	Yes
12316	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12317	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12318	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Todd, Michael	No
12319	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thea, Kaz	Yes
12320	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Luehrmann, Paul F	No
12321	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGowan, Maureen	Yes
12322	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pharr, Paul	Yes
12323	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Romer, Elke	No
12324	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Adman, Eric	Yes
12325	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weigel, Molly	Yes
12326	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Reczek, Bernadette	Yes
12327	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hall, Jennifer	Yes
12328	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	De Groot, Hans	Yes
12329	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Denney, Amanda	Yes
12330	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hurt, Vickie	Yes
12331	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Zendarski, Meryl	Yes
12332	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Clark, Jade	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12333	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCallum, Elizabeth A	No
12334	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		nelson, lois e	No
12335	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	American Citizen	Yates, Harry	No
12336	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weldon, Amy	No
12337	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vo, Kassie	No
12338	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peppin, Marilyn	No
12339	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Carroll, Susan	Yes
12340	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12341	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hall, Suzanne	Yes
12342	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Anthony, Paul	No
12343	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		burgess, charlie a	Yes
12344	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		burgess, charlie a	Yes
12345	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peele, Skylr A	No
12346	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Austin, Maggie E	No
12347	5/10/2010	Master (435846)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardison, Nancy K	No
12348	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Swan, Linda	No
12349	5/10/2010	Yes (435846)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardison, Nancy K	No
12350	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		curtin, phil	Yes
12351	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12352	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Floyd, Jerry M	No
12353	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dubec, Matt A	No
12354	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	USMC(ret)	Dunnagan, mike g	No
12355	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Mara, Maureen	Yes
12356	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Olsen, Rebecca	Yes
12357	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chartier, Nancy	Yes
12358	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McMahan, Ron	Yes
12359	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Marshall, Linda	Yes
12360	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Katsilis, Michael	Yes
12361	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Laken, Mark	Yes
12362	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Peluso, Diane	Yes
12363	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Beres, Danielle	Yes
12364	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Ray, Leslie	Yes
12365	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Minton, Marie S	No
12366	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12367	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Minton, Stephen M	No
12368	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reynolds, Renee	No
12369	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Thalacker, June	Yes
12370	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lillak, Tania	Yes
12371	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Jan W	Yes
12372	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marano-Korbar, Marley A	Yes
12373	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks	ellis, candice c	Yes
12374	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brennskag, Gloria J	Yes
12375	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sullivan, B	Yes
12376	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Assoc.	Bullock, Elizabeth L	No
12377	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Knowles, Anna L	Yes
12378	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Koch, Joann M	No
12379	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Myers, Eddy C	No
12380	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rouse, Velma F	Yes
12381	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Voorhies, Bill & Marilyn	Yes
12382	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CloudySkyPublishing	Laine, Alexis	Yes
12383	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Diane M	Yes
12384	5/10/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Belcastro, Nick	Yes
12385	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Macomber, Brigit	No
12386	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Snyder, Butch	No

0008721

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12387	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Billington, Danielle D	No
12388	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grubbs, Chris	Yes
12389	5/10/2010	Yes (435722)	Unaffiliated Individual		Alden, John S	No
12390	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	King-Wrenn, Kim	Yes
12391	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oliver, Jane	Yes
12392	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCauley, Lila	Yes
12393	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tickner, Kelly	Yes
12394	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caroline Lippincott, Caroline	Yes
12395	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Murphy, Dale	Yes
12396	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Marks, Carolyn	Yes
12397	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Boegner, Jennifer	Yes
12398	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		wojcik, robert a	No
12399	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pike, Jane	Yes
12400	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lippel, Tracy	Yes
12401	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Willumsen, Laura	Yes
12402	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	O'Connell, Ken	Yes
12403	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mutrie, Cheryl	Yes
12404	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Norris, Michael A	No
12405	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12406	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Oklahoma Native Plant Society	Cox, Chadwick	No
12407	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Mars, Virginia C	Yes
12408	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Mole, Marvin L	Yes
12409	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Prose, Claudia C	Yes
12410	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, James	No
12411	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hunt, Chris	Yes
12412	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	SMITH, ROBERT	Yes
12413	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, James	Yes
12414	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zweidinger, Roy B	Yes
12415	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12416	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		CLARKE-ROBERTS, RACHEL	No
12417	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoerter, Jamie D	No
12418	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NJBBA	Finley, George B	No
12419	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vitek, Sandi	Yes
12420	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goode, David B	Yes
12421	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Micham, Ben R	Yes
12422	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schendel, Jill	Yes
12423	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	James, Nancy	Yes
12424	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Skinner, Carol	Yes
12425	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Glover, Tim	Yes
12426	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kelly, Lynn	Yes
12427	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Hostetler, David	Yes
12428	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McEvoy, Jean	Yes
12429	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Irvin, Cynthia J.	Yes
12430	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Funkhouser, Betty	Yes
12431	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Judd, Lil Y	No
12432	5/10/2010	Yes (435722)	Unaffiliated Individual	CCANC	Francis, Ross H	No
12433	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fritch, James	No
12434	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Carolyn	Yes
12435	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mason, Steve E	Yes
12436	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12437	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mutaftchiev, Ivo	No
12438	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Midgett, Elizabeth	Yes
12439	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jasinski, David	Yes
12440	5/10/2010	Yes (436720)	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Connell , Sean	Yes
12441	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lacome, Michael	Yes
12442	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jasinski, David	Yes
12443	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stover, David C	Yes
12444	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12445	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grace, Paul	No
12446	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kelly, Lynn	Yes
12447	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		jereb, linda & jim	No
12448	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Riggs, Bob and Carmen	Yes
12449	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		jereb, linda & Jim	Yes
12450	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Riggs, Bob and Carmen	Yes
12451	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA / NCBBA	Jones, Chris M	Yes
12452	5/10/2010	Master (435959)	Unaffiliated Individual		dunivan, david	No
12453	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swartz, Neil R	No
12454	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oliver, Jim U	No
12455	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Overcast, David M	Yes
12456	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	woods, roth	No
12457	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Herro, Rebecca M	No
12458	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		wallace, raydean s	Yes
12459	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat. Parks Conservation Asso.	Meyer, Tito	No
12460	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		smith, kenneth m	Yes
12461	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sorensen, Steve	Yes
12462	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dodds, K	Yes
12463	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
12464	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Gill, Charles	Yes
12465	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Young, Lindsey	Yes
12466	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McMillan, Evelyn	Yes
12467	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Arnold, Mary	Yes
12468	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Woolley, Clair	Yes
12469	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Wellard, Jennifer	Yes
12470	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Summers, David	No
12471	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hughes, Stephen	No
12472	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA/NCBBA	jackson, keith j	No
12473	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kendrick, Betty	Yes
12474	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Baker, Danielle	Yes
12475	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Clayton W	No
12476	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Logan, S	No
12477	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		stuart, esther	Yes
12478	5/10/2010	Yes (435959)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kramer, Teddy C	No
12479	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pearson, Randall I	No
12480	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Erickson, Kathy	No
12481	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Gandulla, Julie A	Yes
12482	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Epperson, Bee	No
12483	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Veazey, Patricia S	Yes
12484	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bergmann, Amy S	Yes
12485	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		herring, joseph	No
12486	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Uecker, Robert	No
12487	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vaughn, Billie H	Yes
12488	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA, OPBA, CHAC	Rau, Kevin	No
12489	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Quigley, B	No
12490	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Morris, Ron	No

0008723

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12491	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davoust, Patricia	Yes
12492	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Potts, Sienna M	No
12493	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Finley, Margaret E	No
12494	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		moeller, robert c	No
12495	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stevenson, Luke	No
12496	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		taylor, stephen	No
12497	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Charash, William E	Yes
12498	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12499	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilson, Laurie	Yes
12500	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Donahue, Pam S	Yes
12501	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gorman, Charles	Yes
12502	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brahna, Kaori	Yes
12503	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shahid, Ann	Yes
12504	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cagan, Beth	Yes
12505	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stuart, Michael	Yes
12506	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Danna, Alice	Yes
12507	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mathews, Mary	Yes
12508	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hammar, Kristine C	Yes
12509	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Tomlinson, Dale H	Yes
12510	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bridges, Eugene	Yes
12511	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sample, Jackie	No
12512	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Westervelt, Ernestine H	No
12513	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Freeman, Tim J	No
12514	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wolf, Darlene	No
12515	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Mass Beach Buggy Association	Fillman, Don W	No
12516	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Peter T	Yes
12517	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cunningham, Debra	Yes
12518	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Pollak, Gisela	Yes
12519	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Weikel, Jessica	Yes
12520	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		lickman, lisa	No
12521	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Murray-King, Janet	Yes
12522	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Lonoff, Elizabeth	Yes
12523	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12524	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12525	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilson, Michele	Yes
12526	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rudow, Chad A	Yes
12527	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12528	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hartrampf, Karen & John	Yes
12529	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12530	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12531	5/10/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kimsey, Brian	Yes
12532	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Conrad-Antoville, Kristin Anne	No
12533	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davies, Jill	Yes
12534	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Caldwell, Julie	Yes
12535	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nesham, Mary Ellen	Yes
12536	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Greg	No
12537	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Altman, Jonathan	No
12538	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		MARKS, IRA H	No
12539	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12540	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mc Cabe, Kevin	Yes
12541	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carlton, Alonza	Yes
12542	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Mole, Leonard	Yes
12543	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	McGee, Kate	Yes
12544	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Cowling, Michelle	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12545	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beach, Beth	Yes
12546	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Messick, Karen	Yes
12547	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Struble, Daniel	Yes
12548	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brief, Allan	Yes
12549	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spencer, Carol	Yes
12550	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Little, Susan J	No
12551	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Pitt, Alan	Yes
12552	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Millward, Patty	Yes
12553	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	rohrig, eric a	No
12554	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		larsen, joanne	Yes
12555	5/10/2010	No	Civic Groups	Boyette House Condominium Association	Lawson, Donna J	No
12556	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sechrist, Brian	Yes
12557	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kahny, Rachael	Yes
12558	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rosenberger, Maria	Yes
12559	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hodges, Suzanne	Yes
12560	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Biville, Kristina	Yes
12561	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		gould, steve	Yes
12562	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	George, Carol	Yes
12563	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morgan, Edward	Yes
12564	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reynolds, Gail	Yes
12565	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wall, Nancy	Yes
12566	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Butler, William A	No
12567	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carmichael, Victor	No
12568	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hunt, Sharon	Yes
12569	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dunscombe, Justin	Yes
12570	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12571	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blaisdell, jill	No
12572	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fry, Joyce A	Yes
12573	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lenarcic, Barbara M	Yes
12574	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ehrhardt, Carole	No
12575	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	philip, chappel	Yes
12576	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Stobbe, Judy	Yes
12577	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Kevin, Kathryn	Yes
12578	5/10/2010	Yes (428806)	Unaffiliated Individual	Defenders of Wildlife	Faircloth, Diane	Yes
12579	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McMenamin, Sharon L	Yes
12580	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Murden, Brian	Yes
12581	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shoup, Anne	Yes
12582	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12583	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12584	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reed, Dottie	Yes
12585	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gillette, Cynthia H	No
12586	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bass, Betsy	Yes
12587	5/10/2010	Master (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12588	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12589	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Stuart	Yes
12590	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Mara, Ed	Yes
12591	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weakland, Mark	Yes
12592	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dunoyer, Jean	Yes
12593	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12594	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Righter, Susan H	No
12595	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blanks, Eric T	Yes
12596	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA NCBBA	Kirkpatrick, Robert K	Yes
12597	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cisneros, Alexis C	Yes
12598	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harrisl, Carolyn B	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12599	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Cole, Richard B	No
12600	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Covington, Joseph	No
12601	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kurtz, mike A	No
12602	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harrisl, Carolyn B	No
12603	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		turner, gideon	Yes
12604	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shields, Tim G	Yes
12605	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Olander, William T	No
12606	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peluso, Jane C	No
12607	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wallace, Sandra	Yes
12608	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Irwin, Hannah	No
12609	5/10/2010	No	Civic Groups	durant station condominium association	mckeen, samuel	No
12610	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bennet, Grant	Yes
12611	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Hatteras Realty	Hale, Barbara	Yes
12612	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tawes IV, James C	Yes
12613	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Seward, Chris D	No
12614	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clayton, Hap	Yes
12615	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA,NCBBA,NJBBA,CHAC	Crelin Jr., Robert R	No
12616	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Gary	Yes
12617	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Zimmerman, Paulette	No
12618	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCray, Richard E	Yes
12619	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Outka, Elizabeth	Yes
12620	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'MARA, LAURIE	Yes
12621	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ridd, Susan	Yes
12622	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bjornlie, Harvey	Yes
12623	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leskiw, Tom	Yes
12624	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Moore, William E	No
12625	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gardella, Beth E	Yes
12626	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NepRWA	Lauenstein, Paul	No
12627	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hales, Christie C	No
12628	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hill, Trafford	Yes
12629	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robinson, Juneko J	Yes
12630	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual	Hatteras Realty	Gray, Cami N	Yes
12631	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neal, Marianne J	No
12632	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kinnaird, Shelby	No
12633	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Westermann, Steven	No
12634	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CASPA	HERZING, MICHAEL G	Yes
12635	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Gary	Yes
12636	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Lisa	No
12637	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		S, Erin	Yes
12638	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	N.C. B.B.A./O.B.P.A.	Hales III, E. J	Yes
12639	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hegedus, Steve	No
12640	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fischer, Jay G	Yes
12641	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA OBPA	Rudar, Paul R	No
12642	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club	Heminger, Mary	Yes
12643	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zemaitis, Edas	Yes
12644	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Worgul, Mathew s	Yes
12645	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zemaitis, Edas	Yes
12646	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Burke	Yes
12647	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Coe, Barbara W	Yes
12648	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Boyer, Robert D	Yes
12649	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bowden, Mary C	No
12650	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bull, Barbara J	No
12651	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		daniel, james g	No
12652	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Diff Club	Walker, Tim L	No
12653	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Millen, Joyce	No

0008726

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12654	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Terry	No
12655	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Noel, Barbara A	Yes
12656	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Murray, David W	Yes
12657	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Merrill, Lynn	Yes
12658	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Deters, Ron	Yes
12659	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D'Arco, Lawrence	Yes
12660	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		DiMartino, Andrew	Yes
12661	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zemel, Andrea	Yes
12662	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lawson, Rebecca	Yes
12663	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kraus, Melody	Yes
12664	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		spencer, richard t	No
12665	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ellington, Herb L	No
12666	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Newsome, Stephen L	No
12667	5/10/2010	Master (436192)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hibbs, Ralph	No
12668	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lippa, Rebecca E	Yes
12669	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, C	No
12670	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wiseley, Ken	Yes
12671	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Voronyak, Michael G	No
12672	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holmes, Jr, Gordon W	Yes
12673	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Andrews, Todd	Yes
12674	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bauer, Kevin	Yes
12675	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		zirkle, thomas n	Yes
12676	5/10/2010	Master (436206)	Unaffiliated Individual	CORVA, BRC	Fisher, Jonathan R	No
12677	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Awskiukiewicz, Eileen R	Yes
12678	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12679	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scheer, Julia	No
12680	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Craddock, Charles H	Yes
12681	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stumpf, Henry W	Yes
12682	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Redman, Steven D	Yes
12683	5/10/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sherman, Greg	Yes
12684	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Marilyn	Yes
12685	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kamen, Katherine	Yes
12686	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McKinnon, John	Yes
12687	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Minerva, Valerie	Yes
12688	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walker, Tatjana	Yes
12689	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Littlewood, Ann	Yes
12690	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Terrell, William	Yes
12691	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Laskowski, Barbara	Yes
12692	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Rourke, Robyn	Yes
12693	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pyevich, danielle	Yes
12694	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	van oppen, anne	Yes
12695	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Charles & Ellen	Yes
12696	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schiffer, Marcia	Yes
12697	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rawlins, Elsie	Yes
12698	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crum, Cathy	Yes
12699	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat. Park Conservation	O'Neill, James	Yes
12700	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Reed	Yes
12701	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sayre, joel	Yes
12702	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sweet, grace	Yes
12703	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Briccetti, Eleanor	Yes
12704	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Helmer, Kathleen	Yes
12705	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	a'Becket, Suzanne	Yes
12706	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stendel, Sandi	Yes
12707	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carter, Marian	Yes
12708	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goldsmith, Ken	Yes

0008727

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12709	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Packard, Roger	Yes
12710	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hugins, phyllis	Yes
12711	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Affolter, Angie	Yes
12712	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Work, Patricia	Yes
12713	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garrett, Laura	Yes
12714	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Matlock, KL	Yes
12715	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mejides, Andres	Yes
12716	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hornbeck, Suzanne	Yes
12717	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mitsuda, Michael	Yes
12718	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boyle Schwartz, Donna	Yes
12719	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Keasling, Jon	Yes
12720	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Donnell, Deanne	Yes
12721	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ciccarone, Joan	Yes
12722	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Susan	Yes
12723	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vandermay, Lisa	Yes
12724	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ledgerwood, Lynn	Yes
12725	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Earl, Julia	Yes
12726	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	REff, Lisa	Yes
12727	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weinberg, Norman	Yes
12728	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Crowley, Julie	Yes
12729	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Branton, Michael & Patty	Yes
12730	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thrasher, Amber	Yes
12731	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pihl, Eric	Yes
12732	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aakre, Patricia	Yes
12733	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burgess, Madelaine	Yes
12734	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mastro, Lisa	Yes
12735	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henshaw, Mel	Yes
12736	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	WEITZMAN, ARIN	Yes
12737	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kisamore, Mary	Yes
12738	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ribelin, Rosine	Yes
12739	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rutkowski, Robert	Yes
12740	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Watkins, Peter	Yes
12741	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hensley, Terry	Yes
12742	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McCollum, Sudi	Yes
12743	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fitzgerald, Dena	Yes
12744	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Magee, C Sharyn	Yes
12745	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shank, Carol	Yes
12746	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	evans, dinda	Yes
12747	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ream, Tarn	Yes
12748	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Flynn, Marilyn	Yes
12749	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Brian	Yes
12750	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Alison	Yes
12751	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Meyer, Tanya	Yes
12752	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rice, Charles	Yes
12753	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maslin, Linda	Yes
12754	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bassett, Geraldine	Yes
12755	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ausman, Candi	Yes
12756	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vertrees, Gerald	Yes
12757	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McGlinn, Judith	Yes
12758	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Manley, Virginia	Yes
12759	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Welsh, Rose	Yes
12760	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henzi, Bernadette	Yes
12761	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	carr, seth	Yes
12762	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hunt, Otto	Yes
12763	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morris, Ray	Yes

0008728

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12764	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spangler, Robert	Yes
12765	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bauer, kim	Yes
12766	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lucas, Stephanie	Yes
12767	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Alderman, Cynthia	Yes
12768	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Starzel, Mary Beth	Yes
12769	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Felix, Cathy	Yes
12770	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Christiansen, David	Yes
12771	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reinberg, Don	Yes
12772	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Karlie	Yes
12773	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gooch, Laura	Yes
12774	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Struening, Sue	Yes
12775	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sutphin, Madelaine	Yes
12776	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Novak, Glenn	Yes
12777	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Michael	Yes
12778	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	West, Angela	Yes
12779	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hammond, Marcella	Yes
12780	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Veronica	Yes
12781	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Belz, Paul	Yes
12782	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Linda	Yes
12783	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ferguson, Jannette	Yes
12784	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Burke, Robert	Yes
12785	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Holahan, Tom	Yes
12786	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johns, Julia	Yes
12787	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cornelius, Michele	Yes
12788	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kosec, Dawn	Yes
12789	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henschel, Leonard	Yes
12790	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buecking, Jeff	Yes
12791	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spruill, Eugene	Yes
12792	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wagner, Vickie	Yes
12793	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pham, John	Yes
12794	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cahill, Patricia	Yes
12795	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Williams, Ian	Yes
12796	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simon, Martha	Yes
12797	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	clayton, christina	Yes
12798	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	zimblar, sharon	Yes
12799	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wellman, Julia	Yes
12800	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McKibbin, Anne	Yes
12801	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bartkewicz, Daniel	Yes
12802	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pacheco, Kathleen	Yes
12803	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, Sandra	Yes
12804	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harrison, Harry	Yes
12805	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bliss, Judith	Yes
12806	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Akel III, Ferris	Yes
12807	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nielsen, Hanne	Yes
12808	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	DuTemple, Lesley	Yes
12809	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Kate	Yes
12810	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gault, Ramona	Yes
12811	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carlson, Lois	Yes
12812	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Campbell, Janet	Yes
12813	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lane, Susan	Yes
12814	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Armitage, Wendy	Yes
12815	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	morrison, diane	Yes
12816	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frisbie, Margaret	Yes
12817	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graham, E.	Yes
12818	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rosenthal, Kathlyn	Yes
12819	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boltz, Gina	Yes

0008729

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12820	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	hopey, mark	Yes
12821	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seddon, Klara	Yes
12822	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graudins, Ingrid	Yes
12823	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Blomstrom, Laurie	Yes
12824	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boyd, Sherry	Yes
12825	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wedoff, Margaret	Yes
12826	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lufkin, Thom	Yes
12827	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wrona, Thomas	Yes
12828	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fuller, Tom	Yes
12829	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Creswell, Richard	Yes
12830	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walter, Linda	Yes
12831	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bacinski, Pete	Yes
12832	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sandoval, valentino	Yes
12833	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Phillips, Jim	Yes
12834	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Flett, Mary Anne	Yes
12835	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peters, Wayne B.	Yes
12836	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Abendroth, Hans	Yes
12837	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jaslow, Douglas	Yes
12838	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Black, Teresa	Yes
12839	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Britts, Kathleen	Yes
12840	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stewart, Edward	Yes
12841	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Olden, Karen	Yes
12842	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Markus, Mary	Yes
12843	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Snow, Pamela Rose	Yes
12844	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Poggio, Christina	Yes
12845	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pennoyer, christy	Yes
12846	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hartshorne, Holly	Yes
12847	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barko, Gerry	Yes
12848	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bachmann II, Daniel	Yes
12849	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ferrari, Barbara	Yes
12850	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Chudzik, Mark	Yes
12851	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eckstein, Randi	Yes
12852	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Durham, Dewitt	Yes
12853	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bates, Kim	Yes
12854	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	vizzi, gregory	Yes
12855	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Santana, Kathryn	Yes
12856	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	sommerfeld, barb	Yes
12857	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wuagon, Stanley S	No
12858	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bond, Kay	Yes
12859	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fahlgren, Vivian	Yes
12860	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Warren, Katherine	Yes
12861	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolcott, Valerie	Yes
12862	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kinkley, Gary	Yes
12863	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hill, Barbara Cordero	Yes
12864	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sherry, Constance	Yes
12865	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gill, David	Yes
12866	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	BETANCOURT, jackie	Yes
12867	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schlager, Noah	Yes
12868	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Middleton, Diane	Yes
12869	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Siegner, Roger & Sandra	Yes
12870	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brown, Marjorie L.	Yes
12871	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lenhart, Donna	Yes
12872	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zane, Janis	Yes
12873	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Irving, Paul	Yes
12874	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vanderburgh, Marjorie	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12875	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schuble, Sue	Yes
12876	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilhelm, Heath	Yes
12877	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clarke, Barbara	Yes
12878	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Prudden, Elizabeth	Yes
12879	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clarkson, Richard	Yes
12880	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kane, Kathleen	Yes
12881	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goetz, Deborah	Yes
12882	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	J. Syed, Linda	Yes
12883	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Valentino, Ron	Yes
12884	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Price, Mara	Yes
12885	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wensky, Brittany	Yes
12886	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Paul, Tim	Yes
12887	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hailstone, Joyce	Yes
12888	5/10/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Striped-Bass.com	Redmond, John	No
12889	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Trenkamp, Ryan	Yes
12890	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Malok, Cathleen	Yes
12891	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Park, PsyD, Denice H.	Yes
12892	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cuza, Sandra	Yes
12893	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boleky, Vaughan	Yes
12894	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greenberg, Jay	Yes
12895	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Devey, Jennifer	Yes
12896	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heilbrunn, Randy	Yes
12897	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Havassy, Nancy	Yes
12898	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hornberg, Jean	Yes
12899	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simas, Manuel	Yes
12900	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	pfeiffer, stephanie	Yes
12901	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Budnitz, Norman	Yes
12902	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shannon, Nancy	Yes
12903	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leaf, Elizabeth	Yes
12904	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Henigman, Mali	Yes
12905	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Augur, Wayland	Yes
12906	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Devine, Connie	Yes
12907	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lee, R.D.	Yes
12908	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zulauf, Dale	Yes
12909	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carter, Natalie A.	Yes
12910	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Donahower, Catya	Yes
12911	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Polson, Lois	Yes
12912	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shahbegian, Floss	Yes
12913	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Norton, J	Yes
12914	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	powanda, kim	Yes
12915	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dorsey, R. Stephen	Yes
12916	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miller, Kathleen	Yes
12917	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bahr, Dennis	Yes
12918	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Newell, Stephen	Yes
12919	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graves, Ann	Yes
12920	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bierregaard, Richard	Yes
12921	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	miles, david	Yes
12922	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brenza, Tina	Yes
12923	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Desborough, Laurella	Yes
12924	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Duriseti, Ram	Yes
12925	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wood, Kay	Yes
12926	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Langford, Joanne	Yes
12927	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ackerman, Frank	Yes
12928	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schuett, Gayle	Yes
12929	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Montague, Susan	Yes
12930	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Antone, Mike	Yes

0008731

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12931	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Iversen, Sheryl	Yes
12932	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tedore, Kevin	Yes
12933	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Han, Richard	Yes
12934	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dreith, Carol	Yes
12935	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gershen, Dave	Yes
12936	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martin, Suzanne	Yes
12937	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Linarez, Karen	Yes
12938	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	tullo, john	Yes
12939	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Correia, M. Rute	Yes
12940	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sherwood, Dean	Yes
12941	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Walton, Aggie	Yes
12942	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lee, melissa	Yes
12943	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Karen	Yes
12944	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Casagrand, Mabel	Yes
12945	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mathews, Mary	Yes
12946	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Caroline	Yes
12947	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	crowder, dolores	Yes
12948	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Summers, Carol	Yes
12949	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kircher, Mary	Yes
12950	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	D'Auria, Virginia	Yes
12951	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ellington, Martha	Yes
12952	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	O'Malley, Peter	Yes
12953	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Charpied, Donna	Yes
12954	5/10/2010	Master (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	Ventura County Axle Snappers 4 Wheel Drive Club	Di Primo, Peter S	Yes
12955	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smallwood, Don C	No
12956	5/10/2010	Yes (435722)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12957	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Overstreet, Annette S	No
12958	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gupta, Sam K	No
12959	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sturdevant, Michael	No
12960	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Stieglitz, Joseph S	Yes
12961	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Groom, Pete G	No
12962	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Giannotti, Nancy C	No
12963	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		CLARK, JOANN	Yes
12964	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Herlinger, Nancy E	Yes
12965	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hoch, Lisa	No
12966	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kassan, Lawrence	No
12967	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Boudreau, Ed	Yes
12968	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	North Carolina Beach Buggy Assoc.	Raynes, Michael	No
12969	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Osdoby, Patricia	Yes
12970	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ledda, Barbara	Yes
12971	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mortimer, Mary L	No
12972	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12973	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		SCHULZ, RICK	Yes
12974	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Ray, Jefferson	No
12975	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		windsor, Doanld	No
12976	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kieffer, Ramsay	No
12977	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dudley, Cosby	Yes
12978	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Roberta	Yes
12979	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thompson, RosalieGrace	Yes
12980	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lucchesi, Mary	Yes
12981	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Perry, Crag	Yes
12982	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	luminoso, mary	Yes
12983	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
12984	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	brc	buchkovich, paul A	Yes
12985	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Groom, Donna G	No
12986	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual	Hatteras Island Homeowner	Cantwell, MD, Mary E	Yes
12987	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
12988	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heath, James C	No
12989	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCarty, Sue	Yes
12990	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
12991	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CHAC	DUNNAGAN, MIKE G	No
12992	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Savage, Richard	No
12993	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		johnson, Nancy a	Yes
12994	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		wolf, robert	No
12995	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kuntz, Barbara A	Yes
12996	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Houseworth, Bradley	Yes
12997	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Douglas, Keith I	No
12998	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barrett, Nick	No
12999	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	WSERC	Peters, Robert L	No
13000	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyttle, William	Yes
13001	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Paulson, George I	Yes
13002	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hanburger, Chris G	Yes
13003	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		johnson, nancy a	No
13004	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Platt, David	No
13005	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gloyd, Beverly	Yes
13006	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Driscoll, Thomas	Yes
13007	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wolfe, Duane	Yes
13008	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goldstein, Nancy	Yes
13009	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13010	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cox, Kyle B	No
13011	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Gibbs, Kelly L	Yes
13012	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neill, Kevin J	Yes
13013	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13014	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	Dirt Tricks	Delaney , Nathan J	No
13015	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		alleshouse, zephyr	Yes
13016	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	BRC	Delaney , Amy M	Yes
13017	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	BRC	Youmans, Robert	Yes
13018	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		johnson, nancy a	No
13019	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	M.B.B.A.	Botelho, Kenneth A	No
13020	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	Dirt Tricks	Burns , Greg	No
13021	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mortimer, Mary L	Yes
13022	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	Degenerate Wheelers	Johnson, Nick	No
13023	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Withrow, Amanda	No
13024	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Garcia-Johnson, Angela M	Yes
13025	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Duncan, William C	Yes
13026	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reed, Mary E	No
13027	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Winslow, Kristine B	No
13028	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		wheless, karen s	No
13029	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Church, Cassandra	No
13030	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hogg, Rick	No
13031	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Greenpeace	Suda, Maryska S	Yes
13032	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leh, Robert L	Yes
13033	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13034	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murray, Deborah	Yes
13035	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoglund, Adam	Yes
13036	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Granbur, Lisa	Yes
13037	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Scheer, August	Yes
13038	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Black, Jason	Yes

0008733

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13039	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Denisuk, Debra A	Yes
13040	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jurjans, Janis	No
13041	5/10/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Carpenter, Stepjhen	Yes
13042	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Jonathan W	Yes
13043	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA/NCBBA/UMS	Lick, Robert	Yes
13044	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hux, Lisa K	No
13045	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCormack, Susan	Yes
13046	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13047	5/10/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ferraro, Joe	No
13048	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13049	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Garcia, Jeffery	Yes
13050	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reese, Sallie & Dennis	Yes
13051	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Foster, S.	No
13052	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bisson, Edgar W	Yes
13053	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Seaman, Carol M	No
13054	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, S C	Yes
13055	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lugar, Michael	No
13056	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Byrd, Cynthia	No
13057	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Dambach, Cheryl R	No
13058	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fielder , Mary E	Yes
13059	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zehr, Edward	Yes
13060	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boniface, Kathryn	Yes
13061	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Viken, Barbara	Yes
13062	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Buchanan, Colette	Yes
13063	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kisselburg, Desiree	Yes
13064	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	bollfrass, katha	Yes
13065	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Campbell, Sarah	Yes
13066	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKinney, Andrew S	No
13067	5/10/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual	S-B,com, Maddie's Anglers	Reiley, Ross R	Yes
13068	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cohen, Jonathan B	Yes
13069	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Midgett, Joni	Yes
13070	5/10/2010	Yes (422793)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiehl, Allison	Yes
13071	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13072	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carollo-Zeuner, Christine	Yes
13073	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Shearon, Michael H	Yes
13074	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Banana Patch Fantasy Productions	fernandez, ynez	No
13075	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McNamara, Terry G	No
13076	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Gray, Michelle R	Yes
13077	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walton, Warren A	Yes
13078	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		GOODLING, JAMES	No
13079	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corner, Douglas H	No
13080	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		preston, andrew	Yes
13081	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nealon, Sandra	Yes
13082	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lustig, Sara	Yes
13083	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rockman, Richard	Yes
13084	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stephens, Stephenie E	Yes
13085	5/10/2010	Master (436689)	Unaffiliated Individual		White, Ron	Yes
13086	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Golightly, Marianne	Yes
13087	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Covington, Gail L	Yes
13088	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13089	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13090	5/10/2010	Master (436695)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13091	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Provance, Donna S	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13092	5/10/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Coalition of National Park Service Retirees	Smith, Richard B	No
13093	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13094	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13095	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Larson, Henry B	No
13096	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Blueribbon Coalition	Fredette, Ben J	Yes
13097	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spangler, Robert C	No
13098	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Flenniken, J	Yes
13099	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	NORTH CENTRAL ATV CLUB	ALLARD, GARY L	No
13100	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Finrock, Andrew	Yes
13101	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Baylie, Barbara	Yes
13102	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, Sandra	Yes
13103	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tutino, Lois	Yes
13104	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frank, Monica	Yes
13105	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Porter, Susan E	Yes
13106	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lytle, Denise	Yes
13107	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bellinger, Joe a	Yes
13108	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Member	Ellis, M-F	No
13109	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Collie, Sheila L	Yes
13110	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	N/A, Ingrid	No
13111	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bisantz, Anthony E	Yes
13112	5/10/2010	Yes (436720)	Unaffiliated Individual		OConnell, Lyn	Yes
13113	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vines, Stuart S	No
13114	5/10/2010	Master (436720)	Unaffiliated Individual		OConnell, Arthur	Yes
13115	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grund, Blake R	No
13116	5/10/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Grund, Suzanne K	No
13117	5/10/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Grund, Amy S	Yes
13118	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wheless, Karen S	No
13119	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Paulson, George I	Yes
13120	5/10/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Grund, Molly B	Yes
13121	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Adams, Gayla B	No
13122	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ST. JOHN, LEE	Yes
13123	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Palmer, Janet	Yes
13124	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zimmerman, Kathryn	Yes
13125	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Snegoski, Carolyn	Yes
13126	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wright, Billie M	Yes
13127	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13128	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Katherine	Yes
13129	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13130	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Tarajkowski, Lila	Yes
13131	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lanman, Henry R	Yes
13132	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kist, Rosemary	Yes
13133	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Nitsch, Jessica M-E	No
13134	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Patricia	No
13135	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rlch, Steve	Yes
13136	5/10/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lavis, Robert J	No
13137	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Snow, Joel F	No
13138	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Laird, Lance L	No
13139	5/10/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, Christopher T	No
13140	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Frank	No
13141	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13142	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eades, Debra T	No
13143	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lawrence, Mary	Yes

0008735

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13144	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	BRC	Castle, Alan C	No
13145	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Witte, Jeffrey	No
13146	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dunn, Diane	Yes
13147	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Neel, Riley	Yes
13148	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Travis, Virginia	Yes
13149	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	WILLIAMS, SCOTT	Yes
13150	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McBride, Jenny L	Yes
13151	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Callahan, David E	No
13152	5/10/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hashinger, Bruce M	Yes
13153	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA,OBPA	Hall, Charles A	No
13154	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Carl A	No
13155	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Simpson, Ted A	No
13156	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		huss, phil	No
13157	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parliamentarians	Christian, Karen A	Yes
13158	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13159	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Paxton, Jason	Yes
13160	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Saintsalive Ministries	Buck-Ferguson, Leslie M	Yes
13161	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smock, Arthur D	No
13162	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lanci, Rose M	Yes
13163	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Magnusson, Ronald P	Yes
13164	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fratoe, Vincent	No
13165	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Woodruff, Harrison D	Yes
13166	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kim Zeller, Jennifer	Yes
13167	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Evenstad, Amy	Yes
13168	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fulton, Martha	Yes
13169	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leonardo, Sherry	Yes
13170	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Riley, Patrick W	No
13171	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hennessy, George	No
13172	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Courtney	No
13173	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heilig, Lovie P	Yes
13174	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Scott, Gerone	No
13175	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gibbs, Marsha	No
13176	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Raich, Cathy	No
13177	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13178	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brewer, Craig T	Yes
13179	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sandall, Mark	Yes
13180	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Brenda	No
13181	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McAteer, Marc e	No
13182	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leh, robert L	Yes
13183	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		starr, richard	Yes
13184	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gould, Burnham & Vivian	No
13185	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scott, Michael R	Yes
13186	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scott, Jennifer M	No
13187	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parker, Pattie A	No
13188	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Endicott, Dennis	Yes
13189	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kaiser, Pamela	Yes
13190	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fiala, Kent	Yes
13191	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Jill	Yes
13192	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	glatzer, michael	Yes
13193	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Steger, Zola	Yes
13194	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13195	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Jonah and the boys fishing team	Phillips, Chip	No
13196	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Traverse-Charlton, Paula a	Yes

0008736

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13197	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Carr, Tom	Yes
13198	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Eco-Justice Ministry, FV United Methodist Church	Gregson, Kevin M	No
13199	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hester, Robert S	No
13200	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Popkin, Francine H	Yes
13201	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Jonah and the boys fishing team	Phillips, Chip	No
13202	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13203	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Myers, Jackie C	Yes
13204	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		IANGER, Lillie M	No
13205	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13206	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		tayloe, david	Yes
13207	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Camphire, Christian T	Yes
13208	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hibbs, Ronald A	Yes
13209	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		MIDDLETON, NANCY E	Yes
13210	5/10/2010	Master (436827)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kawa, Sandra M	Yes
13211	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gisler, Eric	Yes
13212	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gabrisko, Tracie	Yes
13213	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Zissel, Paula	Yes
13214	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NRA	Smith, Terral R	Yes
13215	5/10/2010	No	Recreational Groups	equine Adventures	Mattingly, Sylvia	No
13216	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Retired State Trooper	Dumbleton, John P	No
13217	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	taxpayer!	Spink, Rick	No
13218	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Daddow, Carrie	No
13219	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johel, Dave	Yes
13220	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Neal, Daniel L	Yes
13221	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		leszczynski, randall	Yes
13222	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		leszczynski, rita	Yes
13223	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13224	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leh, robert L	Yes
13225	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lockhart, Barbara	Yes
13226	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Beschler, Ellen	No
13227	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		leszczynski, kyra	Yes
13228	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Argentine, Priscilla K	Yes
13229	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Alper, Jeff	No
13230	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bofinger, Janice R	Yes
13231	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13232	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surf Rider Foundation	Shive, Brooke	Yes
13233	5/10/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Whichard, Philip R	No
13234	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Simpson, Eric	Yes
13235	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rowoth, Jim	Yes
13236	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		leszczynski, leah	Yes
13237	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ungar, Luci	No
13238	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		crozier, don	Yes
13239	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Hughes, Bob O	No
13240	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Holmes, Timothy L	No
13241	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		greene, henry f	Yes
13242	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dickinson, David L	Yes
13243	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Midget, Bertie K	No
13244	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Bost, Byard T	Yes
13245	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		butler, rita	No
13246	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	american	sewell, chris g	Yes
13247	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Powell, Annie E	Yes
13248	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13249	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Midtskogen, Ragnar	Yes
13250	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Perry, Kyle L	No

0008737

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13251	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wendler, Jeff	No
13252	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, shawna	Yes
13253	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Aller, Bonnie	Yes
13254	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McDonough, Rebecca	Yes
13255	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Weber, Andy	Yes
13256	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gilliatt, Cynthia	Yes
13257	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dixon, Daniel W	No
13258	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		D'Amico, Donna M	Yes
13259	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		trauger, brittni e	Yes
13260	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Blanton, William E	Yes
13261	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCants, Bernie	No
13262	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bofinger, Daniel	No
13263	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	Blue Ribbon Coalition	Wines, Dan A	No
13264	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCulloch, Joseph W	No
13265	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jurjans, Janis E	No
13266	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Suarez, Juan I	No
13267	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Epping, Jessica A	No
13268	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		jacobs, caleb s	Yes
13269	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hughes, Jay	Yes
13270	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heilig, Jason B	No
13271	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hartnett, John J	No
13272	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Trauger, Penny M	Yes
13273	5/10/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bruckner, Keegan	Yes
13274	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		anderson, seth n	No
13275	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Balfe, Jay	Yes
13276	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gray, Bonnie	No
13277	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cash, Stuart	No
13278	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bennett, Corey L	Yes
13279	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McRae, Stuart R	Yes
13280	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Melissa	No
13281	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Laak, Edwin	Yes
13282	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	St.Clair, Matthew	Yes
13283	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leach, Dorothy	Yes
13284	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Nosal, Vicki	Yes
13285	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bowers, Anne C	Yes
13286	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Leigh, Alex	No
13287	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Elliott, Charles	No
13288	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		chaney, kelley a	Yes
13289	5/10/2010	No	Business	The Outer Banks Wedding Association	Epping, Jessica A	No
13290	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Frey, John W	No
13291	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NC conservation network	Weil, Sarah	No
13292	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Klein Conklin, Jane A	No
13293	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Maginnis , Steven W	Yes
13294	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kennedy, Allan	Yes
13295	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13296	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13297	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Haycock, Garrett D	Yes
13298	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		trauger, timothy n	No
13299	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Frame, Laura	No
13300	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Conklin, David	Yes
13301	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bowers, Anne	Yes
13302	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burnette, Florence S	Yes
13303	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		piechowiak, tyler	Yes
13304	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vollmer, William W	No
13305	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gray, Robin	No

0008738

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13306	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McPherran, Tina L	No
13307	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Epping, Marilyn	No
13308	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13309	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dicken, Jeremy	Yes
13310	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lubeley, Kris	Yes
13311	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Longman-Marien, Deborah	Yes
13312	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jaquess, Theresa	Yes
13313	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schmidt, Dennis P	No
13314	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Moore, Bob	No
13315	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPS	Gamache, Stephanie R	No
13316	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	SaveOurCave.org	Roland, Jon R	No
13317	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Evans, Paul	No
13318	5/10/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Helgeson, Dave	Yes
13319	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Warfield, Laurie	Yes
13320	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13321	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lovett, Dave	Yes
13322	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kunz, James E	No
13323	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Wright, Nathan S	No
13324	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Girard, John P	No
13325	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Jonathan S	Yes
13326	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Grenoble, Sharon W	No
13327	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Savona, Phil	Yes
13328	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CMTRA	Downs, Mel E	Yes
13329	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yanna, Jason A	No
13330	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sink, Steve C	No
13331	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Anderson, Greg	Yes
13332	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	LOCAL	midgett, gilbert r	No
13333	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13334	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gaines, Linda	Yes
13335	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Petersen, John	Yes
13336	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Charles, Brion	Yes
13337	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Johnson, Scotty	Yes
13338	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Strange, Marisa	Yes
13339	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surf Rider Foundation	Emerson, Scott P	No
13340	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Kilmer, Randy	No
13341	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		mccaffrey, patrick s	Yes
13342	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cicchi, Carla	Yes
13343	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reichlin, Marianne	Yes
13344	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Van riper, Daniel F	No
13345	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Duckworth, Shahntay	Yes
13346	5/10/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Roberson, Marika	Yes
13347	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bauchau, Mijanou	Yes
13348	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Kolstad, Patricia A	Yes
13349	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Masem, Greg	No
13350	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	University of Missouri	Elsayed, Mariam A	Yes
13351	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Noone, Molly	No
13352	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA,OBPA,CHAC	Gaskins Jr., Lloyd E	No
13353	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Schraeder, Paul E	No
13354	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Jones, Katherine J	No
13355	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13356	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mendieta, Vince	No
13357	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Brazil, Michael	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13358	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tsosie, David	No
13359	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13360	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	P, D	Yes
13361	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pack, Stuart E	Yes
13362	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rose, Walter E	Yes
13363	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Covington-Huff, Carol D	No
13364	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kuster, Heidi M	No
13365	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		West, Colton R	Yes
13366	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Morris, John	No
13367	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Butler, William O	Yes
13368	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WELLS, JOSEPH W	No
13369	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Sandra F	No
13370	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bangel, addie	Yes
13371	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
13372	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		LaFleur, Terry	No
13373	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Woznick, Merritt	Yes
13374	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Greg L	Yes
13375	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13376	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		probst, shirley	Yes
13377	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Lee, Susan	No
13378	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Angrist, Anka	Yes
13379	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dietrich, Fred S	Yes
13380	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Longworth, bill	Yes
13381	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Charles K	No
13382	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cobb, R j	No
13383	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oliver, Stanley	No
13384	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Core Banks Club, LLC	Hagan, John C	No
13385	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Groetsch, Jack A	No
13386	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Myers, James W	No
13387	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dustin, John C	Yes
13388	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		PATCH JR, FRANK H	No
13389	5/11/2010	Yes (425670)	Unaffiliated Individual		allen, luke l	Yes
13390	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burch, Christine L	No
13391	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Benson, John	No
13392	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Maxwell, Andrew S	No
13393	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pretzsch, James	Yes
13394	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	murray, john	Yes
13395	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nuss, Timothy e	Yes
13396	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Nat'l Parks Cons Association	Buckingham, Hillary G	Yes
13397	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Myers, Dee	No
13398	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		cooper, gary m	Yes
13399	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Everett, Lisa	No
13400	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Higham, James J	No
13401	5/11/2010	No	County Government	Hyde County Government	Ballance, Eugene	Yes
13402	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA, NC Beach Buggy Asso. Recreational Fishing Alliance, Dolphinnettes Anglers Club	Sheppard, James E	Yes
13403	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13404	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WORSLEY, CARL E	Yes
13405	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barclay, Stephen w	No
13406	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Skibinski, Joseph	No
13407	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		gnyra, steve	Yes
13408	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wamsley, James	No
13409	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scott, Barb J	Yes
13410	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stokes, Michael	Yes
13411	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	FJ Schultz & Son Mfg	Schultz, Hugh K	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13412	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Sierra Club, NC Conservation Network, 1Sky	Sossoman, Mark A	Yes
13413	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DeMumbrum, Jack E	No
13414	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Abdo, Alexy J	Yes
13415	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pierce, Christopher A	No
13416	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Higham, James J	No
13417	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		barry, ed	Yes
13418	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Downs, Edward J	No
13419	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Connors, John	Yes
13420	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCrickard, Daryl B	Yes
13421	5/11/2010	No	County Government	Hyde County Government	Ballance, Eugene	Yes
13422	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crist, Joy E	Yes
13423	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Morris, Kathleen S	No
13424	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ferrar, Erik	No
13425	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swartz, Dolores A	No
13426	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13427	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barshis, Darr	No
13428	5/11/2010	Yes (431019)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13429	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13430	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stump, Dale W	No
13431	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Collins, David	No
13432	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stockdon, Patricia W	Yes
13433	5/11/2010	No	University/Professional So	North Carolina Watermen United	Shackelford, Britton T	No
13434	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	na	Cornwell, Cynthia D	Yes
13435	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Woodiwiss, Kim	No
13436	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13437	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	Toyota Land Cruiser Association	Maiellano, Joseph E	Yes
13438	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Brengel, Kristen	No
13439	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Russell, Gregory L	No
13440	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13441	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sawyer, Fred A	No
13442	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cook, James K	Yes
13443	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	obpa	martin, paul	Yes
13444	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13445	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stump, Sharon P	No
13446	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		duPont, Lane A	Yes
13447	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Colbert, Vernon	Yes
13448	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jackson, William J	Yes
13449	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Durgin, Larry	Yes
13450	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Tim W	Yes
13451	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stange, Dodd	No
13452	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McDowell, Amber N	Yes
13453	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yochum, Ronald C	No
13454	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wood, M	Yes
13455	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parsons, Debra M	No
13456	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McIntosh, Natalie	No
13457	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Duckworth, Ed L	Yes
13458	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Franco, Debbie L	No
13459	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	US citizen	Jarvis, Ollie R	No
13460	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Scott, Debra E	Yes
13461	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Park user	McGaw, David	Yes
13462	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jasinski, Paula	Yes
13463	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blackwood, Hank	Yes

0008741

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13464	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual	Kinnakeet Shores Homeowners Association	Cunningham, Keith A	No
13465	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13466	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas Jr, Purvis E	No
13467	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	People for Animal Rights, Inc.	Camorati, Nancy A	Yes
13468	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA, OBPA	Collier, Alan B	Yes
13469	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Griffith, Jennifer	No
13470	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, W.	Yes
13471	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		schindler, victoria	Yes
13472	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ward, Richard N	Yes
13473	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pileski, Mary	Yes
13474	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilligan, Ainslie G	Yes
13475	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Greenberg, Dwight	Yes
13476	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		dreyer, diana y	No
13477	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Andrew, Mike	Yes
13478	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schneider, Nancy	Yes
13479	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gosker, Wendy	Yes
13480	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eubank, Christine	No
13481	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13482	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Astle, William & Sallye	No
13483	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13484	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	home owner	Taylor, Everett H	Yes
13485	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Salyers, Rebecca C	No
13486	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13487	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Conley, Christine	Yes
13488	5/11/2010	No	Business	Southland Trade Corp	White, Travis L	No
13489	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Plotsky, Nancy N	No
13490	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Midgett, Beth	No
13491	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyon, John F	No
13492	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jennette, Dee	No
13493	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnes, Richard T	Yes
13494	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Simcik, Ellen M	Yes
13495	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hall, Herman	No
13496	5/11/2010	Master (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnes, Julie	Yes
13497	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Doherty, David	No
13498	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA, IWLA, SC	Barton, William F	No
13499	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		zirkle, thomas n	Yes
13500	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, William L	Yes
13501	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bunce, Melissa	Yes
13502	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cowan, Joan	Yes
13503	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bard, Christine	Yes
13504	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lippert, Dottie	Yes
13505	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnes, Jarid	Yes
13506	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carreras, Yeiza	Yes
13507	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peters, Steve	No
13508	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Elkus, Bryan S	Yes
13509	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ruckdeschel, Jenny	No
13510	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		MacWelch, Richard P	Yes
13511	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bamford, Sherman	No
13512	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lauder, Theresa	No
13513	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		boyd, rose	Yes
13514	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lifsey, John	No
13515	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Caraco, Nina	Yes
13516	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Austin, Holly F	Yes
13517	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Realtor & IWFA	Petty, Annah A	Yes
13518	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Glen B	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13519	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hissong, Kristin m	Yes
13520	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		McMaster, Belle M	Yes
13521	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rowe, Bonnie	No
13522	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sobotka/Briner, George W	Yes
13523	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Hepburn, Chet	Yes
13524	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		dreyer, diana y	No
13525	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13526	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13527	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudak, Kenn	Yes
13528	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Morrison, Colin L	Yes
13529	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kearse, Mary F	Yes
13530	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13531	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Smith, Craig	No
13532	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kerschner, Patricia	Yes
13533	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Auer, Nancy	Yes
13534	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gower, Patricia	Yes
13535	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lamkin, Melissa	Yes
13536	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	miller, harriet	Yes
13537	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		MIDGETT, ANGEL	No
13538	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goodwin, Elaine	No
13539	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Turner, Jason	Yes
13540	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schawang, S E	No
13541	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	Paradise Ridge Riders	Stanley, Mike	Yes
13542	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Evans, Barbara B	No
13543	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nadolski, Debbie E	No
13544	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Berezansky, Nick	Yes
13545	5/11/2010	No	County Government	County of Hyde	Davis, Tom	No
13546	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Simmons, Chantal v	Yes
13547	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Environmental Defense Fund	Sher, Dena N	Yes
13548	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fraller, Karen A	Yes
13549	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Basnight, Hazel	Yes
13550	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Cheryl	No
13551	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Monica	Yes
13552	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mario, Crystal A	No
13553	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leonard, Anita R	No
13554	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sherrill, Larry D	Yes
13555	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13556	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pilutti, Judith L	No
13557	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA & NCBBA	HANDLON, ROBERT L	Yes
13558	5/11/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnes, Jarid	Yes
13559	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Fonda, Andrew R	Yes
13560	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Fonda, Andrew R	Yes
13561	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Fonda, Andrew R	Yes
13562	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Fonda, Andrew R	Yes
13563	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		CALLAHAN, TERRI	Yes
13564	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13565	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wiseman, Marti C	Yes
13566	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Cynthia	Yes
13567	5/11/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnes, Julie	Yes
13568	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Waldrop, Richard	No
13569	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	US Tax Payers	Zavetsky, Bill	No
13570	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Maschman, Dana	Yes
13571	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lesley, Jayne	Yes
13572	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Tate, Ann	Yes
13573	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ashcraft, Carol	Yes

0008743

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13574	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rosenthal, Mara	Yes
13575	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		BITHELL, KARA	No
13576	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13577	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Kenneth	No
13578	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Farrow-VanDyke, Amanda E	Yes
13579	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		RUCKER, ROGER L	No
13580	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brake, Ricky C	No
13581	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mosher, Kim	No
13582	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		SIDWELL, WENDI D	Yes
13583	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Filigenzi, Barbara J	Yes
13584	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		cleaver, john e	No
13585	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual	Dare Building Supply	Gray, Catherine "Cassie" E	Yes
13586	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Blackwood, Heidi	Yes
13587	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mosher, Kim	No
13588	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mosher, Kim	No
13589	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Ervin, Heather	No
13590	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Evans, Ryan P	Yes
13591	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weston, Angela L	Yes
13592	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harty, Karen	No
13593	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Cape Hatteras Anglers Club	Finley, Margaret E	No
13594	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Belcastro, Nick Sr.	Yes
13595	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Ladd	No
13596	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pollock, Stephen C	No
13597	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cook, Jaime I	Yes
13598	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pardi, Scott	No
13599	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schorr, Paul	Yes
13600	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ball, Evelyn	Yes
13601	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Towey, Shawn	Yes
13602	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harty, Karen	No
13603	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA/OBPA	OBX, Woody	Yes
13604	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holloman, Larry W	No
13605	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lemasters, Deborah L	Yes
13606	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fail, Bryan A	Yes
13607	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bascue, Ashley D	Yes
13608	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13609	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ross, Adelaide R	Yes
13610	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Donnell, John E	Yes
13611	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harty, Karen	No
13612	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Coleman, Michael W	Yes
13613	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McDaniel, Deanna	No
13614	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bueter, Peter S	Yes
13615	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Letso, Michael G	No
13616	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pollock, Stephen C	No
13617	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ford, Nedra R	Yes
13618	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13619	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Virginia Coastal Access Now	Vachet, Charles D	No
13620	5/11/2010	No	State Government	Governor of North Carolina	Perdue, Bev	No
13621	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13622	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Giannotti, Nancy C	No
13623	5/11/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Giroux, Robert T	Yes
13624	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGlone, Colleen	No
13625	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wald, Michael	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13626	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pollock, Stephen C	No
13627	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13628	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Kenneth	No
13629	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ellis, Georgia	Yes
13630	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bartone, Robin L	No
13631	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lenk, Vivienne	Yes
13632	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bilbrough, Randy	Yes
13633	5/11/2010	Master (437325)	Unaffiliated Individual		Antle, Chuck	Yes
13634	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Fischer, Richard J	No
13635	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Claunch, Jonathan B	Yes
13636	5/11/2010	Yes (437325)	Unaffiliated Individual		Antle, Donna	Yes
13637	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pollock, Stephen C	No
13638	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Farr, Janice	No
13639	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fabing, Keith	Yes
13640	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Davenport, David	Yes
13641	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McFetters, Richard	Yes
13642	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SIMON, SHARLENE	Yes
13643	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hoke, Harlie	Yes
13644	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Balazs, Rosemary	Yes
13645	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCCCHA	Hales Gordo, Carla P	No
13646	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ford, Ralph D	Yes
13647	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13648	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ieland, Iex	Yes
13649	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Moore, Robert E	Yes
13650	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Buckwalter, Ted	Yes
13651	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13652	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pollock, Stephen C	No
13653	5/11/2010	No	Non-Governmental	TWF-TV PROD, INC.	Gordon, Herb D	No
13654	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rosemond, Carol H	No
13655	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Brown, Richard A	Yes
13656	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bridges, William E	Yes
13657	5/11/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnes, Richard	Yes
13658	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelly, Tim m	No
13659	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Graham, M. Eileen	No
13660	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whittemore, Richard W	Yes
13661	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, A	Yes
13662	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Quidley-Canning, Leann	No
13663	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harvey, Bill	No
13664	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13665	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilson, Jim	No
13666	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Perry, Susan	Yes
13667	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kaminski, Margaret	Yes
13668	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Shade 3rd, W Robert	Yes
13669	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Levins, Karen L	No
13670	5/11/2010	Yes (422893)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnes, Frank	Yes
13671	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Presley, Jacob B	No
13672	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, N/A	Yes
13673	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	preservebeachaccess.org	Patrizzi, Barry J	No
13674	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brooks, Janet	Yes
13675	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rapp, Brian	Yes
13676	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Salman, Steven F	No
13677	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Michael, Gary	No
13678	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McFarlane, Lisa G	No
13679	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		HARRELL, BOBBY F	No
13680	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hayes, Butch	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13681	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Esposito, Robert	No
13682	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13683	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13684	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Diemer, Donald J	No
13685	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Haggard, Cori	Yes
13686	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Eduardo	No
13687	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		HILD, DAVID & AMY	Yes
13688	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carson, Debbie & Glenn	Yes
13689	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Laws, Pat	Yes
13690	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Trisha L	No
13691	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Yates, Richard	Yes
13692	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Liebowitz, Susan	Yes
13693	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Berry, Michael	Yes
13694	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coker, Nancy	Yes
13695	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Altman, Karen	Yes
13696	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		michaels, stephan i	No
13697	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gould, Burnham	No
13698	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		stevens, emanuel n	Yes
13699	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Russick, Sharon	No
13700	5/4/2010	Yes (437402)	Business	Paw Print Design Studio	Lowe, Victoria	No
13701	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13702	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	McGettigan, James E	Yes
13703	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		LeReche, Lauren	Yes
13704	5/4/2010	Master (437402)	Business	Paw Print Design Studio	Lowe, Victoria	No
13705	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudson, Mark	No
13706	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCrary, Rosellen C	Yes
13707	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudson, Mark	No
13708	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Runyan, Larry D	Yes
13709	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKenna, Patricia R	No
13710	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudson, Mark	No
13711	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ricchuiti, Cosmo M	Yes
13712	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudson, Mark	No
13713	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sheriff, Lenny C	No
13714	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yingling, Tom and Barb	Yes
13715	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Shipman, Jeffery	Yes
13716	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fort, Patricia A	Yes
13717	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCrary, Rosellen C	Yes
13718	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marley, Lisa	No
13719	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Horan, Diane	No
13720	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudson, Mark	No
13721	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neill, Carol A	Yes
13722	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yingling, Tom and Barb	Yes
13723	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13724	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	White, Jeff	Yes
13725	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wong, Richard M	Yes
13726	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13727	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Becky	Yes
13728	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lea, James	No
13729	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Lary, Alyssa	Yes
13730	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Williams, Tracy L	Yes
13731	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		SLOAN, GEOFFREY	Yes
13732	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	RFA	Paquette, Patrick	No
13733	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lea, James	No
13734	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yingling, Kathryn R	No
13735	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gray, Bette	No
13736	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lea, James	No

0008746

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13737	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carson, Robert	No
13738	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Andersen, Edward	No
13739	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wells, Mari	No
13740	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Butler, Steven	No
13741	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Andrew R	No
13742	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keller, David E	Yes
13743	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hearington, Joseph W	No
13744	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Wildlife Federation	N/A, N/A	No
13745	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shifflett, Jeremy	No
13746	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, candy c	No
13747	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Russo, Daniel	No
13748	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Cleary, Stephen F	Yes
13749	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Basilone, Joe	No
13750	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Conover, William R	No
13751	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Marsh, Tracy	Yes
13752	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gartland, Brandi	Yes
13753	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gauthier, SandraJ.	Yes
13754	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thompssen, Linda	Yes
13755	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'HOP, WILLIAM C	Yes
13756	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Guilfoyle, Helen M	No
13757	5/5/2010	No	Business	Natural Art Surf Shop	Busbey, Carol	No
13758	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Balhoff, Andrew	Yes
13759	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Conover, Shirley A	No
13760	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Conover, Ernest W	No
13761	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13762	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Messenger, William	No
13763	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fontenot, Thomas J	Yes
13764	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Baxter, Bonnie W	No
13765	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	retired Army	Davis sr, mike a	No
13766	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Wayne	No
13767	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dufala, Allen	No
13768	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	United Moble Sportfishing	Finley, George B	No
13769	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13770	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelly, Charles W	Yes
13771	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blakney, Harold	No
13772	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Sheridan, Michelle L	Yes
13773	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyons, Marcia M	No
13774	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Tawes, Angela C	No
13775	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Norman, Vernon	No
13776	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Madonna, Donna M	Yes
13777	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	American Sportfishing Association	Doerr, Patty	No
13778	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Francis, James V	No
13779	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dufala, Allen	No
13780	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dedelow, Laura J	Yes
13781	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ackley, Miriam C	No
13782	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Sam	Yes
13783	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13784	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McElhaney, Jim	Yes
13785	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Caudill, Dana E	Yes
13786	5/11/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		hoffman, steve l	No
13787	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Whitton, Cheryl A	Yes
13788	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Koon, Janie C	Yes
13789	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Daidone, Ignazia	Yes
13790	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gerwin, John	Yes
13791	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stone, James	Yes

0008747

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13792	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Erb, Carol L	Yes
13793	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Surfrider Foundation	Hill, Charlotte P	Yes
13794	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rak, Michael J	Yes
13795	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13796	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Seavey, Paul A	No
13797	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cotten, Robert G	No
13798	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13799	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Branch, Harry T	Yes
13800	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hajost, Theresa W	Yes
13801	5/11/2010	No	Civic Groups	Hatteras Village Civic Association	Robinson, Dennis W	No
13802	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cantwell, Christine	No
13803	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13804	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blakney, Harold	No
13805	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Austin, Christopher	Yes
13806	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jorlett, Joel	No
13807	5/11/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	American Bird Conservancy, Center For Biological Diversity, et al	Rylander, Jason C	No
13808	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13809	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kanipe, Dean P	Yes
13810	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	cca-nc	austin , sr., william e	Yes
13811	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Huff, Michael E	Yes
13812	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Buddenbohn, Robert	No
13813	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Livingston, Richard W	No
13814	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Courtney, Carolyn	No
13815	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13816	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weston, Jim W	Yes
13817	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Piland, Hilary C	No
13818	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Farrow, Jennie R	No
13819	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zimmerman, Owen M	Yes
13820	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13821	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mitchell, C. Madeline	No
13822	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Sun Realty	Dozier, Heather L	Yes
13823	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barley, William V	No
13824	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		MARKS, THERESA A	No
13825	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Roberts, Thaddius R	Yes
13826	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual	resident	Gordon Thompson, Katherine White and	No
13827	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual	UPS	Levis, Jack	No
13828	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barley, Will P	No
13829	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mayberry, April	No
13830	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Desert Awareness Committee	Lindall, LaVonne L	Yes
13831	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Piland, Michael	No
13832	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Watson, Donna J	Yes
13833	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		warner, dennis m	No
13834	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mills, William A	No
13835	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kohan, Michael	No
13836	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiker, Joe M	No
13837	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13838	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13839	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vercruyssen, Jane	No
13840	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NAtional Parks Conservation Association	DeSena, Rosemary	Yes
13841	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Quinerly, James R	No
13842	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Butler, Carol	No

0008748

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13843	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oetting, Heidi C	No
13844	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crammond, Laurie	No
13845	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neal, Dan G	Yes
13846	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gay, Timothy	Yes
13847	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Elizabeth	No
13848	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cutino, Albert	No
13849	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Adams, Nicole	No
13850	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blakney, Harold	No
13851	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stevenson, Gina L	No
13852	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Folb, Sheri	No
13853	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gremillion, Thomas	Yes
13854	5/11/2010	No	Non-Governmental	Disability Rights North Carolina	N/A, N/A	No
13855	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Falcon, Vidal	Yes
13856	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Herrell, James V	Yes
13857	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Folb, Frank	No
13858	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dineen, S	No
13859	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		greene, tammie b	No
13860	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Graham, John D	No
13861	5/11/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	The Wilderness Society	Kilmer, Kathy	No
13862	5/5/2010	No	County Government	Dare County	Johnson, Richard	No
13863	5/11/2010	No	Non-Governmental	National Multiple Sclerosis Society	Weidner, Laura	No
13864	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sutton, Alan & Melinda	No
13865	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13866	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13867	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13868	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fodrie, Melinda	No
13869	5/5/2010	No	Business	Tradewinds Tackle	Sutton, Alan & Melinda	No
13870	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chu, William	Yes
13871	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gaidos, Carol H	No
13872	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Spalding, Richard	No
13873	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Delwiche, Donald A	Yes
13874	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jeanne, Sykes	No
13875	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual	Homeowner	Murray, Mike	No
13876	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ammirati, Lisa	No
13877	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sutton, Alan	No
13878	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	campbell county heritage association	tileston, susan a	No
13879	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Spehnkouch, Scott	No
13880	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sutton, Alan	No
13881	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Spehnkouch, Thomas	No
13882	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Roy J	No
13883	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Fred W	No
13884	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sonnenberg, Eileen	Yes
13885	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	mccracken, william	Yes
13886	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sonich, Susan	Yes
13887	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Noce, Joseph F	Yes
13888	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sutton, Alan	No
13889	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hickman, Carinne R	Yes
13890	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		MIDGETT, Kristen	No
13891	5/5/2010	No	Civic Groups	Ocracoke Civic & Business Association	Sutton, Melinda	No
13892	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crews, Anne	Yes
13893	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Collins, Sharon K	Yes
13894	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ballance, Joan K	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13895	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		MIDGETT, THOMAS A	No
13896	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Daly, Annette E	Yes
13897	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blakney, Harold	No
13898	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Haskett, Mullen C	No
13899	5/11/2010	Yes (435846)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lalonde, Connie	No
13900	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		LaBranche, Richard	Yes
13901	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13902	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Comer, Sean C	No
13903	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kovalesky Jr., Chester E	No
13904	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hetherington, Curtis L	Yes
13905	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Citizen	Mosher, Debora D	No
13906	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hetherington, Katie B	Yes
13907	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA, OBPA	Spurling, Beverly B	Yes
13908	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moorefield, Garry & Jo	Yes
13909	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rucker, Allison L	No
13910	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peavler, Wayne L	No
13911	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Osborne, Terri	No
13912	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		& Karol, John	No
13913	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ballance, david l	Yes
13914	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wong, Eric S	Yes
13915	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Suhr, Carol H	Yes
13916	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		eustis, rick	Yes
13917	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oliver, Stanley	Yes
13918	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	US Citizen	Smith, Robert K	No
13919	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rucker, George K	No
13920	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Midgett, Trisha M	No
13921	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spilman, Carolyn	Yes
13922	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cromer, Mary	Yes
13923	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Zovistoski, Charlotte K	Yes
13924	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Combs, Janie W	Yes
13925	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hill, Kenneth R	Yes
13926	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Earrame, Jason	No
13927	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Brian K	No
13928	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13929	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Chip Connelly	Yes
13930	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rucker, Janet L	Yes
13931	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		conroy, kathleen m	No
13932	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hampton, Michelle	Yes
13933	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bisbing, Whitney C	Yes
13934	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robinson, Leslie J	Yes
13935	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rouse, James	No
13936	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Meads, Edith	No
13937	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pye, Doris	No
13938	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		Joyce, Curt w	Yes
13939	5/11/2010	No	Business	Recreational Fishing Alliance - South Carolina	Covington, Wesley A	No
13940	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13941	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13942	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13943	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carmen, Frank	No
13944	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13945	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hajost, Scott A	Yes
13946	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13947	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rucker, Joyce M	No
13948	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13949	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13950	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13951	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Torres, J.	No
13952	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blakney, Harold	No
13953	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual	Individual Homeowner	Hammernik, Judith A	Yes
13954	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wancko, Ronald J	No
13955	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Goold, Jonathon	Yes
13956	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lawson, Robert R	Yes
13957	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mullinax, Pat	Yes
13958	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bruce, Jean A	Yes
13959	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual	Robert High Properties	High, Robert M	Yes
13960	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnett, Donna S	Yes
13961	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fail, Anne Marie	No
13962	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Aldridge, Jon C	Yes
13963	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Allen, Robert F	Yes
13964	5/11/2010	No	Business	Midgett Realty, Hatteras Landing, Teach's Lair Marina, Midgett Realty Construction Inc.	Midgett, Timothy W	No
13965	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Restaino, Barbara	Yes
13966	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Vicki	Yes
13967	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Trujillo, Yolanda	Yes
13968	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	no organization	Hranicka, Thomas & Louise	Yes
13969	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	ncbba	aikin, arthur	Yes
13970	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		brabham, lorraine	No
13971	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holloman, Betty S	Yes
13972	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		markey, tim and jean	Yes
13973	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kuehnel, Robert H	No
13974	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crews, Moriah	No
13975	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Deibel, Carolyn R	No
13976	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		green, jeff	No
13977	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walker, Jennifer	Yes
13978	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hurst, S M	Yes
13979	5/11/2010	Yes (426525)	Unaffiliated Individual		Plasse, Ernest	No
13980	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dorman, Doug A	Yes
13981	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Recreational Fishing Alliance - South Carolina	Covington, Wesley A	No
13982	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
13983	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCrary, John D	No
13984	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dorman, Roxanne D	No
13985	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Loke, Karen E	No
13986	5/11/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	New York City Audubon	Phillips, Glenn	No
13987	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, Monica	No
13988	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
13989	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rich, Steve	Yes
13990	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBA	Lamperti, Deborah M	No
13991	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Deibel, Charlotte	Yes
13992	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sanchez, Rachel M	No
13993	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swartz, Neil	No
13994	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ELLISON, BRIAN	No
13995	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kaminsky, Eliz	Yes
13996	5/11/2010	No	Business	MIDGETT BROS INC, HATTERAS MARLIN MOTEL	MIDGETT, THEODORE S	No
13997	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Muller, James J	No
13998	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Briggs, Mitch L	No

0008751

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
13999	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kooyman, Linda	No
14000	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pedersen, Edward	No
14001	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Young, Margaret	No
14002	5/11/2010	No	Federal Government	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Benjamin, Pete M	No
14003	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dawsom, Carol J	No
14004	5/11/2010	Master (437718)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lynch, Pat	No
14005	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Recreational Fishing Alliance	Paquette, Patrick J	No
14006	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14007	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mako, Daniel	Yes
14008	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Currens, Leslie	Yes
14009	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cronin, Peter	Yes
14010	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ger, Genise	Yes
14011	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Clendenen, Steve	Yes
14012	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Eichelman, Paige	Yes
14013	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Roberts, Don	Yes
14014	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Defino, Barbara	Yes
14015	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Singer, Judy G	Yes
14016	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lewis, Nancy	Yes
14017	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goodwin, Linda	Yes
14018	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gyulay, Randolph	Yes
14019	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Benham, Hal	Yes
14020	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boeschen, John	Yes
14021	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peterson, Kathryn	Yes
14022	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reiger, Christopher	Yes
14023	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koprowicz, Kent	Yes
14024	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Koepf, Wanda	Yes
14025	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Darco, Melissa	Yes
14026	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smyth, Joanne	Yes
14027	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martinez, Katherine	Yes
14028	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gelfer, M.	Yes
14029	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kerr, Angela	Yes
14030	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schoenberg, Marc	Yes
14031	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Esparza, Theresa	Yes
14032	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	ogata, peggy	Yes
14033	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pankow, Carolyn	Yes
14034	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Janet	Yes
14035	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Waldner, Joseph	Yes
14036	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	SilverKnight, Deborah	Yes
14037	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Freed, Vera	Yes
14038	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Modarelli, Dave	Yes
14039	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hassenger, Carol	Yes
14040	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Harvey, Joe	Yes
14041	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Ballard, Bill Ballard	Yes
14042	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Goodykoontz, Donald	Yes
14043	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Quitugua, Patti	Yes
14044	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dewenter, David	Yes
14045	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fulmer, Terry	Yes
14046	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Newman, Roberta E.	Yes
14047	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	lewis, Victoria	Yes
14048	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gates, and Mrs. Dan A.	Yes
14049	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Switalla, James	Yes
14050	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leskiw, Sue	Yes
14051	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	phillips, valerie	Yes
14052	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Derringham, Helena	Yes
14053	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Griffiths, Paul	Yes
14054	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schmidt, Sarah	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14055	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wright, Paula	Yes
14056	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Phillips, Emily Lee	Yes
14057	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hayes, Susan	Yes
14058	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lade, C. M.	Yes
14059	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lovell, Lawrence	Yes
14060	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Martz, Russell	Yes
14061	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kerbel, Carol	Yes
14062	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Coontz, Patricia	Yes
14063	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Smith, Christopher	Yes
14064	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morin, Ed	Yes
14065	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lomega, Ellen	Yes
14066	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sanford, Ted	Yes
14067	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rockwell, Linda	Yes
14068	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Frueh, j	Yes
14069	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lynn, Yvonne	Yes
14070	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Read, Seth	Yes
14071	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hanna, Jeremy	Yes
14072	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schwartz, Pamela	Yes
14073	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	alleshouse, zephyr	Yes
14074	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Phillips, Ida	Yes
14075	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mitchell, Aime	Yes
14076	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	VaJames, Carole	Yes
14077	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Reed, David	Yes
14078	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kiffney, Cathy	Yes
14079	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Edwards, Denise	Yes
14080	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hettell, Carolyn	Yes
14081	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Creed, Diane	Yes
14082	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lopatynski, Jess	Yes
14083	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bryant, Frederick	Yes
14084	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bowers, Anne C	Yes
14085	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cannady, Lee	Yes
14086	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	obpa	Lyle, Fred	No
14087	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gruendl, Robert S	Yes
14088	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kaminsky, Christina M	Yes
14089	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	American Citizen	Collins, Grayson	No
14090	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fyke, George H	Yes
14091	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Park user	McGaw, David	Yes
14092	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		BeHage, Robert L	No
14093	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tolson, Lisa	No
14094	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGaw, Vivian	Yes
14095	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		barris, vicky g	Yes
14096	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rhodes, David M	Yes
14097	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Seale, Daniel & Rita	Yes
14098	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swartz, Neil	No
14099	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Avon Property Owners Assoc.	Bernard, Charles D	Yes
14100	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Doebly, Gene	No
14101	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kelly, shirley a	No
14102	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamilton, Elizabeth	Yes
14103	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tokazowski, Donna L	Yes
14104	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Sammons, Rita J	No
14105	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Moser, Glenn A	No
14106	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14107	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hooper, John R	Yes
14108	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fisher, C	Yes
14109	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fort, Terri Y	Yes
14110	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rhodes, Charles B	No

0008753

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14111	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14112	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McKee, Shawn A	No
14113	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Terveer, Phil	Yes
14114	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Jarman, James T	Yes
14115	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Graham, Judith	Yes
14116	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Vannicola, Elizabeth	Yes
14117	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Throne, Joanne	Yes
14118	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barker II, John	No
14119	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	american citizen	Collins, Grayson `	No
14120	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schleicher, Charles J	No
14121	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Austin, Susan M	No
14122	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NC Beach Buggy Assoc.	Bernard, Charles D	Yes
14123	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Edwards, Debbie L	No
14124	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hervert, Carla	No
14125	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thibodeau, Monica	Yes
14126	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hux, Lisa K	No
14127	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Beach Pharmacy	Evans, Steven C	No
14128	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14129	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Suhr, George	Yes
14130	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual	Home Owner	Bruce, Mark W	No
14131	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		COMBS, TODD B	Yes
14132	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Maxwell Jr, LeRoy S	No
14133	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Connolly, Valerie	Yes
14134	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Babics, Dianne	No
14135	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gomba-Mack, Suzanne N	No
14136	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Porter, Erin	No
14137	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, Stephen	No
14138	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sposato, William T	Yes
14139	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mandulak, Bill	Yes
14140	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weinstock, John L	Yes
14141	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		allen, larry	No
14142	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		fenich, mary lee	Yes
14143	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		zirkle, tom n	Yes
14144	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Houle, Catherine C	Yes
14145	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hengerer, Nancy	Yes
14146	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kisiel, Christina	Yes
14147	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Serra, Dawn	Yes
14148	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walker, Tracy	Yes
14149	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Henderson, Kurt A	Yes
14150	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14151	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Chicamacomico Banks Fire & Rescue	Stephany, Christopher A	Yes
14152	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		D'Amato, Victor A	No
14153	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Michael	No
14154	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Bud	No
14155	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	personal	Switzer, Bill	No
14156	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Munson, Stephen L	No
14157	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		marcuson, fred e	Yes
14158	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tasso, Ronald G	Yes
14159	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		blankenship, darryl j	Yes
14160	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Silverhtorne, Brett c	Yes
14161	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gregory, Spencer	Yes
14162	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		spruill, melissa h	Yes
14163	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		spruill, carl h	Yes
14164	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, Kevin	Yes
14165	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Griffin, Scott	Yes

0008754

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14166	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rinda, Robert W	No
14167	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Silverhtorne, Brett c	Yes
14168	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Bud	No
14169	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swingle, Robert C	Yes
14170	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Boone, Jim	No
14171	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Carroll, Jr., William A	No
14172	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	National Wildlife Federation	Farrow, Tom F	Yes
14173	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fredrickson, Eric	Yes
14174	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hagemann, Kenneth C	No
14175	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hafer, Sarah	No
14176	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hagemann, Fran	No
14177	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA, NCBBA,AHOA,	Brooks, Eugene M	No
14178	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Dale	No
14179	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kornmann, Christopher	Yes
14180	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gless, MaryAnn	Yes
14181	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sikorski, Duane	Yes
14182	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Murphy, Ted	Yes
14183	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	McAlister, Katherine	Yes
14184	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Stat, Linda	Yes
14185	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Anderson, Steven	Yes
14186	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Grace-Braun, Virginia	Yes
14187	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Garber, Sandra	Yes
14188	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Batty, Philip	Yes
14189	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Moore, Tyler	Yes
14190	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	LaPan, Linda	Yes
14191	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Boland, MaryJane	Yes
14192	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Jones, Edmund	Yes
14193	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Seitz, Jennifer	Yes
14194	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cordero, Ann	Yes
14195	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Oswald, Jamie	Yes
14196	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Carroll, Chuck	Yes
14197	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sharkey, Kevin	Yes
14198	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Miers Smith, Susan	Yes
14199	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Dyche, Danny	Yes
14200	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Heiser, Emily	Yes
14201	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Driscoll, Barbara	Yes
14202	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Fitzgerald, Mary A	Yes
14203	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morris, Ronnie	Yes
14204	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bandanza, Suzanne	Yes
14205	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Mitchell, Joann	Yes
14206	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Pickford, Tracy	Yes
14207	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Spencer, Lyle	Yes
14208	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Phinney, Mary	Yes
14209	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		wheless, karen s	No
14210	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		du Von, Jay	Yes
14211	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	Brown's Mount Association, Inc.	Wilson, John F	Yes
14212	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gibson, Timothy J	Yes
14213	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		C, L	Yes
14214	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Brien, Edward J	No
14215	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Abashian, Tamara	No
14216	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14217	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Brien, Michael	No
14218	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peterson, Matthew T	No
14219	5/11/2010	Potential (436827)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	Hays, Jeannitte	Yes

0008755

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14220	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14221	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crall, Tom	Yes
14222	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Patsell, Travis W	No
14223	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mayhew, John R	No
14224	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Camp, Edward	Yes
14225	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weaver, Jr, Les H	Yes
14226	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer Banks Anglers Club	Light, John E	No
14227	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Sherry C	No
14228	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barton, Doug	No
14229	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14230	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Woods, Daniel J	Yes
14231	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, Watson A	Yes
14232	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Ware, Charles M	No
14233	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NC Beach Buggy Assoc.	Tucker, John T	No
14234	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Thompson, Susan	Yes
14235	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Woolley, Lisa	Yes
14236	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Wilson, Jamie	Yes
14237	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Feissel, John	No
14238	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Switzer, Maryellen P	No
14239	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burch, Connie C	Yes
14240	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Little, Patty M	No
14241	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Sherry C	No
14242	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	ENVISCI3330 Land Use Managment	Brady, Denean A	Yes
14243	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Brien, John J	Yes
14244	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		,	No
14245	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Macey, Mary	Yes
14246	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wheeler, Anne M	Yes
14247	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barbee, Paul S	Yes
14248	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Golding, Jeffrey A	Yes
14249	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	n/a	Byrd, Terry	No
14250	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leh, Robert L	Yes
14251	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burch, John A	No
14252	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	LaGrange, Perry K	No
14253	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cashman, Dale O	Yes
14254	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Roy J	No
14255	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14256	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Johnny M	No
14257	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fisher, Samantha	No
14258	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Roy J	No
14259	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Roy J	No
14260	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Local	Campbell, Norm	No
14261	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewkowksi, Ilan	Yes
14262	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Warren, Ron or Stephanie	No
14263	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kraly, Tom M	Yes
14264	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hawkins, Roy B	No
14265	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Feese, Kevin H	No
14266	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Dement, Richard H	Yes
14267	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fitch, Gerald	Yes
14268	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyons, Stuart	No
14269	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Barnett, Richard	Yes
14270	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sokolski, Lynn	Yes
14271	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spraggins, Thomas A	No
14272	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jernigan, Doug	Yes
14273	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ruggles, Jeanne	No

0008756

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14274	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parr, William C	Yes
14275	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wolfe, Patricia	No
14276	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Moser, Constance E	No
14277	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cullifer, Margaret R	Yes
14278	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer Banks Restaurant Assoc.	Enoch, Sharon	No
14279	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14280	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hallett, Stephen R	Yes
14281	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Webster, Earlene H	Yes
14282	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dwight, Rita	Yes
14283	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14284	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	North Carolina Beach Buggy Association	Eckler, Robert	No
14285	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Lisa	Yes
14286	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Helle, Amy	Yes
14287	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Donald W	No
14288	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gulch, Jillian	No
14289	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kmecz, Glenn & Pamela	Yes
14290	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA	Manson, Ivan B	No
14291	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Runyan, Dan	Yes
14292	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Friese, Darlene	Yes
14293	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ferrell, Jeff	Yes
14294	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cotten, Jr., Charles C	Yes
14295	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cullifer, Margaret R	Yes
14296	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, William T	No
14297	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zeh, Brian R	No
14298	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		pappas, marie	No
14299	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Forman, Brittainy	Yes
14300	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Manson, Ivan B	No
14301	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	resident	Kogut, Thomas E	Yes
14302	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnston, Gary	Yes
14303	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Cord, Erin	Yes
14304	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Myszka, Abbey	Yes
14305	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Hedman, Susan	Yes
14306	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cullifer, Margaret R	Yes
14307	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stevens, Stanley L	No
14308	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Todd, Thomas E	No
14309	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Detwiler, Sandra	No
14310	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, jason	No
14311	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Boyle, Vincent E	No
14312	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Obenberger, Jon T	Yes
14313	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rizzo, Charles	No
14314	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Norman, Donna	Yes
14315	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Auwarter, Rodney B	No
14316	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Roberts, Gary E	No
14317	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rizzo, Charles	No
14318	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OPBA	Updike, Susan G	Yes
14319	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jeffrey, Wescoat B	No
14320	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Todd, Mary Jane	No
14321	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cullifer, Margaret R	No
14322	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Leh, Robert L	No
14323	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jarvis, Ward	Yes
14324	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Fox, Tammy	No
14325	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gillikin, Misty R	Yes
14326	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Snedeker, Vera E	No
14327	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Jennifer G	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14328	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caron, John H	No
14329	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Morgan, Lonnie T	Yes
14330	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bracher, Capt. Arch	No
14331	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wills, Jeffrey	Yes
14332	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sitz, John H	Yes
14333	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Auwarter, Deborah A	No
14334	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kehs, mark s	No
14335	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caron, Christine L	No
14336	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hicks, Jeremy S	No
14337	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual	Blue Ribbon Coalition	Hershey, G	Yes
14338	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Todd, A Morris	No
14339	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stone, Melvin	Yes
14340	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14341	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sheriff, Logan W	No
14342	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stubbs, Matthew E	Yes
14343	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Widen, Stephen D	No
14344	5/11/2010	No	Civic Groups	Kinnakeet Civic Association	Augustson, Jennifer B	No
14345	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tomlinson, Khristi A	Yes
14346	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Krumsiek, Anthony M	No
14347	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pantone, Donald S	No
14348	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Widen, Carol A	No
14349	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	schultz, jessica	Yes
14350	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Young, Jennifer	Yes
14351	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gavic, Aaron	Yes
14352	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schoenfelder, Chris	Yes
14353	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Schalk, Tracy	Yes
14354	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	miller, lauren	Yes
14355	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, Kristie	Yes
14356	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Auwarter, Julianne M	No
14357	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Krumsiek, Paula M	No
14358	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Steagall, Mike	No
14359	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tuck, Margaret	Yes
14360	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bowers, Stephanie S	Yes
14361	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Widen, Andrew S	No
14362	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Wake Audubon, NC Coastal Federation	Wilson, Harry E	Yes
14363	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Widen, Patrick S	No
14364	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caron, Jr, John H	No
14365	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caron, Shannon M	No
14366	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		mORRISON, Steve k	No
14367	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Jennifer G	No
14368	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		McKenney, Lorraine G	No
14369	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caron, Crystal L	No
14370	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holmes, Tyler	Yes
14371	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McIntosh, John M	No
14372	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Friend, Richard	No
14373	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ensogna, Samuel T	Yes
14374	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, David M	No
14375	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lenhart, Bob L	No
14376	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		CONOVER, JUDY G	Yes
14377	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caron, Colleen H	No
14378	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, David M	No
14379	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Schober, Corey	No
14380	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wassell, Pat L	No
14381	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Jennifer G	No
14382	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caron, Colleen H	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14383	5/11/2010	Master (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		howerton, Micheal e	Yes
14384	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, David M	No
14385	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Jennifer G	No
14386	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		jordan, zachery h	Yes
14387	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Partin, Marcia	No
14388	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, David M	No
14389	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14390	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		ramsey, cory a	Yes
14391	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Jennifer G	No
14392	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wassell, Robert	No
14393	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sheriff, Elliott G	No
14394	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lagere, Michelle	No
14395	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Roy J	No
14396	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Caron, Katie	No
14397	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rice, Sue	No
14398	5/11/2010	No	Civic Groups	Ocracoke Civic and Business	Esham, David s	No
14399	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Medley, Mary D	No
14400	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lofty, Angela	Yes
14401	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Rice, Dave	No
14402	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chamberlain, John E	No
14403	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		Street, Molly	No
14404	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Knicely, Darin A	No
14405	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pothier, Gary	No
14406	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Greene, Carl C	No
14407	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pothier, Linda	No
14408	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whiteheart, Russell	Yes
14409	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, David M	No
14410	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Gary	No
14411	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Celia	No
14412	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		ruck, christopher w	Yes
14413	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		Robinson, Janelle r	No
14414	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beard, Joe H	No
14415	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DeBlieu, Jeff and Jan	Yes
14416	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cullifer, Travis L	Yes
14417	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jernigan, Raymond E	No
14418	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Lowrance, Rebecca	Yes
14419	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	fillhart, kali	Yes
14420	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Auwarter, Jenna C	Yes
14421	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Jennifer G	No
14422	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		Showerman, Tiffany m	Yes
14423	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		stanley, constance f	Yes
14424	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		Showerman, Tiffany m	Yes
14425	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Anders, Lynn B	Yes
14426	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NAPA	rowe, woody	No
14427	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14428	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		Atkins, Chandanette	Yes
14429	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14430	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sismour, Rachel	Yes
14431	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hudson, Cynthia A	Yes
14432	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Francis, Holly	Yes
14433	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyons, Patrick T	No
14434	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Roy J	No
14435	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		bowens, chae t	Yes
14436	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heine , Kurt	Yes
14437	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		Groux, Franklin a	Yes
14438	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Frank	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14439	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Horace	Yes
14440	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		stanley, rachel e	Yes
14441	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smock, Addie	No
14442	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, grace	Yes
14443	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Niebuhr, Robert H	No
14444	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		lighiser, james t	Yes
14445	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	PEPC	gross, alexanra a	Yes
14446	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Drache, Kay E	Yes
14447	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		may, katie	Yes
14448	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		skinner, brandon w	Yes
14449	5/11/2010	Yes (438535)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ingram, Stephen L	Yes
14450	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		gundersen, david m	No
14451	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		meadow, morgan m	Yes
14452	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		trower, christopher a	Yes
14453	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	none	Kehl, David E	Yes
14454	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wells, Leigh	Yes
14455	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ernolm, wendy	No
14456	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		mabry, samantha d	Yes
14457	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beecher, Sharon L	Yes
14458	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		cavarretta, katrina m	Yes
14459	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		ortiz, cynthia	Yes
14460	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McGinnis, Katherine T	Yes
14461	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ramsey, Beverly	Yes
14462	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lofty, Hannah J	Yes
14463	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual	American, Voter, Resident, US Citizen, Tax Payer, Lover of Nature and the Outer Banks accesstobeach	Simon, Jose & Sharon	Yes
14464	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		widner, katy	Yes
14465	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		rivera, daniel	Yes
14466	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dente, Jr, Michael A	No
14467	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		stewart, karolane	Yes
14468	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Midgett, Todd L	No
14469	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schmidt, Mike	Yes
14470	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		priest, sequoia c	Yes
14471	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scrogin, Jennifer D	Yes
14472	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		braent, jason	Yes
14473	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Green, Francis S	No
14474	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14475	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		shafer, tyler m	Yes
14476	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		jennings, remmington x	Yes
14477	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gaertner, Jo C	Yes
14478	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14479	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Oliver, Victoria T	Yes
14480	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		galloway, leon	Yes
14481	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jansson, Peter A	Yes
14482	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Groetsch, Nellene M	Yes
14483	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clark, Ian M	No
14484	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14485	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		russell, joseph a	Yes
14486	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Crawford, Frank C	Yes
14487	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Contestable, John	No
14488	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hanna, James	Yes
14489	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		sanguineti, Vincenzo R	Yes
14490	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Balaban, Arlene	Yes
14491	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Foust, Meredith G	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14492	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Van Riper, Jeanne	No
14493	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyons, Marcia M	No
14494	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		dunmont, gavin	Yes
14495	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		daijha, alston j	Yes
14496	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		cheatham , leon s	Yes
14497	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		perry, bryan l	Yes
14498	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		daijha, alston j	Yes
14499	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gwin, Betsy H	No
14500	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		rogers, jordan	Yes
14501	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kramer, Dan	Yes
14502	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		stafford, nick	Yes
14503	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Binder, Holly	No
14504	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		vernon, kyle	Yes
14505	5/11/2010	Yes (438535)	Unaffiliated Individual		BARRIS, BOB D	Yes
14506	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		ddavis, joshua	Yes
14507	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jennette, Wayland W	No
14508	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		storer, kathleene e	No
14509	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moseley, Billy	Yes
14510	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kiser, Joshua J	No
14511	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		smith, courtney	Yes
14512	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hilborn, Elizabeth	Yes
14513	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		evano, sean	Yes
14514	5/11/2010	Yes (438535)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hughes, Meg	No
14515	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whiteheart, Michelle	Yes
14516	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scott, Natalie R	Yes
14517	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		armstrong, victoria	Yes
14518	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Matthews, Heather L	No
14519	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chamberlain, Joanne	No
14520	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		faltz, brandon	Yes
14521	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Noel, Betty B	Yes
14522	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Klea, Joe	No
14523	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Stehle, Robert L	Yes
14524	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		jennings, graham	Yes
14525	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCBBA & Realtor	Davis, Laura J	No
14526	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		robert, MAY W	Yes
14527	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		khamar, juhi	Yes
14528	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		crawford, alex	Yes
14529	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	WSIA	Forman, Trip	No
14530	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		degracia, chris	Yes
14531	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		du Pont, Brent	No
14532	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	USA Citizen	Davenport, Walt E	Yes
14533	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		wyman, natalie s	Yes
14534	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		yancey, mattew	Yes
14535	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelliher, Stephen J	No
14536	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		brown, will	Yes
14537	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Christopher, Bob	No
14538	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		yocum, rebekah a	Yes
14539	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		bigelow, dillon	Yes
14540	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		delozier, daniel b	Yes
14541	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		chaney, kelley a	Yes
14542	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Yingling, Tom and Barb	Yes
14543	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		horvel, chris m	Yes
14544	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		press, shea m	Yes
14545	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		whitside, darron	Yes
14546	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bradshaw, Patricia R	Yes
14547	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kosstrin, Robin	Yes

0008761

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14548	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Broadway, Robert G	No
14549	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ingalls, Jeffrey S	Yes
14550	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bryk, Joyce	Yes
14551	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Bilicska, Joe and Marcella	Yes
14552	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Youngman, Julie	Yes
14553	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hartmann, Jim	No
14554	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mahler, Peggy E	No
14555	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Storer, Francis L	Yes
14556	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		de Jong, Sven M	Yes
14557	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		hubbard, emily	Yes
14558	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Albright, Charles L	Yes
14559	5/11/2010	No	Business	PAW PRINT DESIGN	LOWE, Victoria C	No
14560	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		minglosk, tyler	Yes
14561	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14562	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		goddard, ricky	Yes
14563	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kinnaird, Rick F	No
14564	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vaccarello, John A	No
14565	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		peterson, katie a	Yes
14566	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		whiteside, darron	Yes
14567	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pope, James R	Yes
14568	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		willows, casey	Yes
14569	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		malone, rebecca d	Yes
14570	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barlow, Cheryl S	No
14571	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown, David	No
14572	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Jersey Devil's Fishing Club	Taylor, Douglas A	No
14573	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		baysa, steve a	Yes
14574	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		calloway , billy	Yes
14575	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Phelan, Mike	Yes
14576	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		carden, amber	Yes
14577	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		carwile, victoria	Yes
14578	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		johnson , ryan	Yes
14579	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		han, mark	Yes
14580	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pope, Cheryl F	Yes
14581	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Downs, Paula	No
14582	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Devlin, Thomas M	No
14583	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Craigie, Connie B	Yes
14584	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		prendergast, dillon	Yes
14585	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weidner, Richard L	Yes
14586	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		rhodes, jacob	Yes
14587	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Marko, Lynne	No
14588	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyons, Jim	Yes
14589	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NCHS	N/A, N/A	Yes
14590	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		leedy, sam	Yes
14591	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tart, Ernie	Yes
14592	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		garcia, allison	Yes
14593	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Couch, Daniel C	No
14594	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		watson, chase	Yes
14595	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	N/A, N/A	No
14596	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Yanuck, Bob	Yes
14597	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		johnson, ethan	Yes
14598	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14599	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Galloway, James D	No
14600	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Modlin, Adam G	Yes
14601	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bridge, Laura	Yes
14602	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jared, Barbara A	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14603	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		young, james r	Yes
14604	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14605	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		lemore, devin l	Yes
14606	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tuttle, William G	Yes
14607	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Coalition for Beach Access	Nelson, Jeffrey S	No
14608	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Modlin, Aaron N	Yes
14609	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Morris, Meredith	Yes
14610	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gisler, Laura	Yes
14611	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Leineweber, Mary	Yes
14612	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Loring, Pam	Yes
14613	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gisler, Greg	Yes
14614	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		olom, stephen	Yes
14615	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schuster, Diane E	Yes
14616	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		norton, brad	Yes
14617	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lyons, Jim	Yes
14618	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Haynes, Michael L	Yes
14619	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		hitchcock, dennis	Yes
14620	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Woodard, Will	No
14621	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		lane, jacob	Yes
14622	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Coats, D	Yes
14623	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		shelley, alyssa g	Yes
14624	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	CHAC, NCBBA, OBPA	Anderson, Phillip S	Yes
14625	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mancera, Marta M	Yes
14626	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		lodge, forrest r	Yes
14627	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lawrence, Louis G	Yes
14628	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Powell, Robert G	Yes
14629	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Godwin, Jr., William E	Yes
14630	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		horan, diane	No
14631	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	University of California	Furner, Mary O	No
14632	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	New Jersey Beach Buggy Association	Taylor, Douglas A	No
14633	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blessing, Wayne	No
14634	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Contestable, April D	Yes
14635	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA, CHAC, NCBBA	Anderson, A D	Yes
14636	5/11/2010	Yes (438130)	Unaffiliated Individual		lyda, sarah c	Yes
14637	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Forest Hills Baptist Men	Anders, Preston L	Yes
14638	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jennette Jr., Wayland W	No
14639	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		coleman, steve	No
14640	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Wertenbaker, William	No
14641	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fripp, Daniel C	Yes
14642	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14643	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Carter, Nancy F	Yes
14644	5/11/2010	Yes (436546)	Unaffiliated Individual		coster, stephen e	Yes
14645	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barlow, Jr, Henry C	No
14646	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Long, Barry E	No
14647	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dumbleton, Mary Jo	Yes
14648	5/11/2010	Master (438402)	Unaffiliated Individual		kurtz, donna m	No
14649	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gano, Victor D	No
14650	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Buchanan, Rodney B	No
14651	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	National Parks Conservation Association	King, Gregory F	No
14652	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Gaulin, Richard	Yes
14653	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Maslow, Peggy	Yes
14654	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Kane, Evan	Yes
14655	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Fitzmaurice, Virginia C	Yes
14656	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Crisp, Dale	Yes

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14657	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14658	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		B, Kathy	Yes
14659	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Porter, John	No
14660	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Almon, Bill	Yes
14661	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		layton, jean	No
14662	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robinson, Dennis W	No
14663	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fernandez, Michelle	Yes
14664	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Gerwe, Gregg	No
14665	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, BETH	No
14666	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		kraly, karen	Yes
14667	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14668	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heilig, Lovie P	Yes
14669	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brough, Michael	Yes
14670	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Garey, Cristina	Yes
14671	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Maddox, Cheryl	Yes
14672	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		parrish, donnie r	No
14673	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Keatley, Richard C	Yes
14674	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14675	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whiting, Carolyn	No
14676	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14677	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Goodwyn, Katherine N	Yes
14678	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Alderman Jr, Robert G	Yes
14679	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schmidt, Andrea	No
14680	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lane, Daniel J	Yes
14681	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoefler, Mary V	Yes
14682	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Peters, Myrna B	Yes
14683	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Couch, Raymond S	No
14684	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	colony, stephanie	Yes
14685	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Diff	Wilson, Robert D	Yes
14686	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bruzzano, Paul R	Yes
14687	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Sutherland, Rebecca M	Yes
14688	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer Banks Preservation Association	Almon, Cathy L	Yes
14689	5/11/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA ,APOA, MD and DC bars	siebert, arlie b	No
14690	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Elmore, Barbara F	Yes
14691	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Deibel, Geoffrey S	Yes
14692	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamlet, John R	Yes
14693	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ogden, Matt	Yes
14694	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hicks, Christinia	No
14695	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Rogers, Andrew	Yes
14696	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual	NPCA	Alto, Sandra	Yes
14697	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		harris, meredith c	Yes
14698	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Hatteras Civic Association	Foster, William A	No
14699	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Nugent III, Alfred S	No
14700	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Nugent III, Alfred S	No
14701	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Elmore, John J	Yes
14702	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	Yes
14703	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Peirce, Connie	Yes
14704	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	North Carolina Beach Buggie Association	Nelson, Edward D	No
14705	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		Sullivan, Florence	Yes
14706	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Nugent III, Alfred S	No
14707	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thornton, Ann Marie	Yes
14708	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ensogna, Lisa M	No
14709	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gaskill, Jr., Enoch C	No
14710	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Nugent III, Alfred S	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14711	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Auwarter, Jared A	Yes
14712	5/11/2010	Yes (430946)	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14713	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Sullivan, Florence	Yes
14714	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer Banks Preservation Association	Almon, Cathy L	Yes
14715	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gardner, Gina	Yes
14716	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weston, Patricia S	No
14717	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Thornton, Ann Marie	Yes
14718	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Heidi J	No
14719	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Weston, James W	No
14720	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	MPA/MSES 2011, IU-SPEA	Hyman, Martin	Yes
14721	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual	Audubon	Robinson, Richard	Yes
14722	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	OBPA	Nugent III, Alfred S	No
14723	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Coastal Conservation Association	Salp, Christopher T	Yes
14724	5/11/2010	Master (438530)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal	No
14725	5/13/2010	Yes (438530)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, James	No
14726	5/13/2010	Yes (438530)	Unaffiliated Individual		Upton, David	No
14727	5/13/2010	Yes (438530)	Unaffiliated Individual		Giannotti, Nancy	No
14728	5/10/2010	Master (438535)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal	No
14729	5/13/2010	Yes (438535)	Unaffiliated Individual		Upton, David	No
14730	5/13/2010	Yes (438535)	Unaffiliated Individual		Giannatti, Nancy	No
14731	5/11/2010	Master (438539)	Unaffiliated Individual		Giannatti, Nancy	No
14732	5/13/2010	Yes (438539)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, James	No
14733	5/13/2010	Yes (438539)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal	No
14734	5/11/2010	Master (438542)	Unaffiliated Individual		Upton, Betty	No
14735	5/13/2010	Yes (438542)	Unaffiliated Individual		Baum, Johnny	No
14736	5/13/2010	Yes (438542)	Unaffiliated Individual		Baum, Betty	No
14737	5/13/2010	Yes (438542)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal	No
14738	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Kimberly	No
14739	5/10/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Bike Walk Virginia	Perry, Kimberly	No
14740	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wojciechowski, Ginger	No
14741	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hooper, Zenovch	No
14742	5/10/2010	No	Business	Catfish Potter	Camp, Edith	No
14743	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Krenzel, James	No
14744	5/10/2010	Yes (438580)	Unaffiliated Individual		Medlin, Sonya	No
14745	5/10/2010	Potential (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Medlin, Tim	No
14746	5/10/2010	Master (438580)	Unaffiliated Individual		Medlin, Tim	No
14747	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spiess, Sharon	No
14748	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Patrick, Olive	No
14749	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mason, Linda	No
14750	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beck, Elsie	No
14751	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Beck, Horatio	No
14752	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Buhler, JoAnn	No
14753	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hagedon, Sam	No
14754	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shea, Jacqueline	No
14755	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Clay, Jimmy	No
14756	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwester, Eugene	No
14757	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwester, Audrey	No
14758	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rothman, Phifer	No
14759	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hamilton, Ted	Yes
14760	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Quillen, Howard	No
14761	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Boys Jorlett, Joel and Elizabeth	No
14762	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Valchet, Dave	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14763	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Myer, Merrill	No
14764	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lamm, Kimberly	No
14765	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pitt, Alan	No
14766	5/1/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lent, Dennis	No
14767	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Jeff	No
14768	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ouellette, A. Joseph	No
14769	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whittaker, Mike	No
14770	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gilmour, M. Ian	No
14771	5/14/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Riffe, Thomas	No
14772	5/7/2010	No	Town or City Government	Kitty Hawk Town Council	Morris, Lynn	No
14773	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cox, Richard	No
14774	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Dan F	No
14775	5/7/2010	Master (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Geref, Dennis	No
14776	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robert, Paul	No
14777	5/7/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Seymour, Jessica	No
14778	5/7/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Boy, John	No
14779	5/7/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Henry, William	No
14780	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Metzgar, Patti	No
14781	5/7/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Greward, Robert	No
14782	5/7/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mel, A	No
14783	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, J.E.	No
14784	5/7/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hunkele, Cal	No
14785	5/7/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bell, Steve	No
14786	5/7/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Howell, Don	No
14787	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pierson, James and Vicki	No
14788	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Furr, Dora M	No
14789	5/4/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Poole, Matt	No
14790	5/4/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Venema, Phil	No
14791	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dodenhoff, Glenn	No
14792	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gerard, W. Robert	No
14793	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hathorne, Scot E	No
14794	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gehman, Jr., Carl W	No
14795	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jones, Clarence	No
14796	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hoelscher, Gregory	No
14797	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lea, James	No
14798	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Taylor, Joy	No
14799	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Daniels, Thomas	No
14800	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Laughon, Jr, Frank	No
14801	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Wash	No
14802	5/6/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Summers, David	No
14803	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilson, Jlm	No
14804	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burke, Jack	No
14805	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Berridge, Tom	No
14806	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burke, Denice	No
14807	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Letourneau, Oliver	No
14808	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cooper, Lisa	No
14809	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dodenhoff., Glenn	No
14810	5/10/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Heyneman, Laura	No
14811	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Allen and Lee	No
14812	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barnett, Eldon	No
14813	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bagwell, James	No
14814	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Michael	No
14815	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wuerth, Andrea	No
14816	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Dee	No
14817	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Preston, Pat	No
14818	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwarz, Barbara	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14819	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rogers, Opal	No
14820	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Toben, Megan	No
14821	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jordan, Jo-Elisa	No
14822	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zeagler, Robert	No
14823	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Egghart, Chris	No
14824	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Reynolds, Trafton	No
14825	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hissey, Steve	No
14826	4/25/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Newbold, Mr and Mrs John	No
14827	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wier, Jr, Dallas	No
14828	5/6/2010	No	Town or City Government	Outer Banks Visitors Bureau	Buske, Paul	No
14829	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual	Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce	Tine, Paul	No
14830	5/6/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Thomas, Jr, Watson	No
14831	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gery, Michael	No
14832	5/4/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Benner, Stacy	No
14833	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eustis, III, Frederic	No
14834	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eustis, III, Frederick	No
14835	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Karnes, Clyde	No
14836	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Karnes, Brenda	No
14837	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		NA, NA	No
14838	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Howard, Eddie	No
14839	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wojkowski, Gerard	No
14840	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Long, Iris	No
14841	5/11/2010	Yes (429116)	Unaffiliated Individual		Willard, Daniel	No
14842	5/4/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Zeeman, Charlie	No
14843	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Waterfield, Gilda	No
14844	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stump, Eric	No
14845	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swartz, Neil	No
14846	5/4/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Vickhouse, Mike	No
14847	5/4/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Poole, Daniel	No
14848	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, David	No
14849	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		NA, NA	No
14850	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zachwieja, John	No
14851	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shelton, Henry	No
14852	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dunn, Edward	No
14853	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lea, James	No
14854	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fleming, Patricia	No
14855	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Righter, John	No
14856	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dennis, Jr, Curtis	No
14857	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dennis, Wanda	No
14858	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wright, Albert	No
14859	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Heiser, Richard	No
14860	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burbic, Mark	No
14861	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Patchel, Gary	No
14862	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		NA, NA	No
14863	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neill, Janice	No
14864	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cohen, William	No
14865	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jordan, Lynn	No
14866	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Righter, John	No
14867	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Self , Louis	No
14868	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wilson, Jim	No
14869	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Duke, Cecil	No
14870	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Samuel	No
14871	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Samuel	No
14872	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Kimberly	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14873	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Donahue, Larry and Pam	No
14874	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Alderson, George & Frances	No
14875	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eustis, III, Frederic	No
14876	5/10/2010	No	Business	Outer Banks Restaurant Association	Enoch, Sharon	No
14877	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Huff, Nancy	No
14878	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Dee	No
14879	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barber, Everett	No
14880	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Outlaw, Brenda	No
14881	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rardin, Tim	No
14882	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Matthews, Bruce	No
14883	5/7/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Nathan	No
14884	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cotes, Susan	No
14885	5/7/2010	No	State Government	North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources	Daniel, Louis	No
14886	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Magliar, Stern J	No
14887	5/7/2010	No	State Government	NC Marine Fisheries Commission	Bizzell, Robert	No
14888	5/10/2010	No	Recreational Groups	North Carolina Beach Buggy Association	Keene, W. James	No
14889	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dodenhoff, Glenn	No
14890	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lehman, Wayne	No
14891	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lehman, Susan	No
14892	5/11/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Roberts, Karen and Bobby	No
14893	5/11/2010	Yes (438535)	Unaffiliated Individual		Moir, Cathy	No
14894	5/14/2010	Yes (438542)	Unaffiliated Individual		Waterfield, Gilda	No
14895	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Laws, Joe	No
14896	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robert, Julie H	No
14897	5/14/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Nagel, Paul E	No
14898	5/14/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Mckown, Ray	No
14899	5/10/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Grimes, Wayne	No
14900	5/10/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pridgen, Wynton K	No
14901	5/10/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reynolds, Reece	No
14902	5/14/2010	Yes (438625)	Unaffiliated Individual		McConnell, John B	No
14903	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		unkkknown, unknown	No
14904	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		unkkknown, unknown	No
14905	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		unknown, unknown	No
14906	5/14/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ellinwood, Jack D	No
14907	5/14/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Harrington, Jeremiah F	No
14908	5/14/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Whittaker, Mike	No
14909	5/14/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Bernard, Charles and Marjory	No
14910	5/14/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Benner, Jr., Richard W	No
14911	5/14/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Corcoran, Mark R	No
14912	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Corbett, Crystal	No
14913	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		James , Catherine	No
14914	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Riopel, Wendy	No
14915	5/2/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Jolliff, Frances	No
14916	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hioson, Ardith	No
14917	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Meeker, Leonard	No
14918	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bingney, Michael	No
14919	5/10/2010	No	Business	Mooney and Associates	Mooney III, John	No
14920	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mowers , Carol	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14921	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Furr, A Keith	No
14922	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lutz, Shirley	No
14923	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Korab, Terry	No
14924	4/29/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Reed, Donald	No
14925	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Campbell, PhD, Janet	No
14926	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Knaus, Mr and Mrs Ron	No
14927	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ritchie, Marjorie	No
14928	5/11/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Riopol, Rick	No
14929	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Koping, Kent	No
14930	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		NA, NA	No
14931	5/10/2010	No	Business	Red Drum Tackle Shop, Inc	Eakes, Bob	No
14932	5/8/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Folb, Frank	No
14933	5/5/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Long, Stephen and Louise	No
14934	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kohlman, Roxanne	No
14935	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kohlman, Chris	No
14936	5/10/2010	Yes (436108)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Patti	No
14937	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Labrum III, Joseph	No
14938	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Broadbent, Dorothy	No
14939	5/4/2010	No	State Government	North Carolina General Assembly	Basnight, Marc	No
14940	5/4/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kayota, Steven	No
14941	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wells, C. Robert	No
14942	5/10/2010	No	State Government	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	Myers, Gordon	No
14943	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Metzgar, Mike	No
14944	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hooper, Zenovch	No
14945	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Lawrence	No
14946	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Cape Hatteras Anglers Club	Hardham, Lawrence	No
14947	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Cape Hatteras Anglers Club	Hardham, Lawrence	No
14948	5/11/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Cape Hatteras Anglers Club	Hardham, Lawrence	No
14949	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bowers, Don	No
14950	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
14951	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Foster, Ernie	No
14952	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stump, Valerie	No
14953	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swartz, Dolores	No
14954	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Stump, N/A	No
14955	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, David	No
14956	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, David	No
14957	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, David	No
14958	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, David	No
14959	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, Rick	No
14960	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, David	No
14961	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, David	No
14962	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, David	No
14963	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dawson, Carol Dillon	No
14964	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Lawrence	No
14965	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Lawrence	No
14966	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Lawrence	No
14967	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Lawrence	No
14968	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Lawrence	No
14969	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Lawrence	No
14970	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Lawrence	No
14971	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Luizer, Virginia	No
14972	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Luizer, Virginia	No
14973	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Raynes, Michael	No
14974	5/9/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Torres, Judy and John	No

0008769

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
14975	5/11/2010	No	Civic Groups	Outer Banks Group	Maddock, Sidney	No
14976	5/11/2010	No	Civic Groups	Outer Banks Group	Hardham, Larry	No
14977	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Jim	No
14978	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Benson, John	No
14979	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Jim	No
14980	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Jim	No
14981	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kavanaugh, Natalie Perry	No
14982	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		State Executive Committee, North Carolina Republican	No
14983	4/26/2010	No	Non-Governmental	Dare County Republican Party	White, Peregrine	No
14984	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Donahue, Pam	No
14985	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Daly, William	No
14986	5/10/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Martin, Nathan	No
14987	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tennant, Raymond	No
14988	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Koping, Kent	No
14989	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barker, Doug	No
14990	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barker, John	No
14991	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Calvert, Pat	No
14992	4/26/2010	No	Non-Governmental	Dare County Republican Party	NA, NA	No
14993	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Lawrence	No
14994	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barshis, Darr	No
14995	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bigney, Michael	No
14996	5/10/2010	No	Business	Mooney and Associates	Mooney, John	No
14997	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hinson, Stephen and Ardith	No
14998	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Haynes Cates, Susan	No
14999	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
15000	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Bob	No
15001	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dillon Dawson, Carol	No
15002	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pratt, George	No
15003	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scott, Michael	No
15004	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Kenneth	No
15005	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Woodrow, Heather	No
15006	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Zubal, Darlene	Yes
15007	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Henry, Robert	No
15008	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scott, Jennifer	No
15009	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Mowers, Carol	No
15010	5/10/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Cape Hatteras Access Preservation Alliance	Hardham, Larry	No
15011	5/11/2010	No	County Government	Dare County Board of Commissioners	Judge, Warren	No
15012	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pellissier, Lillian A	No
15013	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bibbey, Analee G	No
15014	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Jim	No
15015	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dudley, Mr. and Mrs. Cosby E	No
15016	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Aaron	No
15017	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Jim	No
15018	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Merritts, The	No
15019	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shields, Johnny	No
15020	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hobble, Virginia K	No
15021	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Russ, Linda	No
15022	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Oakley, Rickey	No
15023	5/11/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Ferguson, David	No

0008770

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
15024	5/12/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lamm, Stephen	No
15025	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Elston, Michael J	No
15026	5/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brady, Mary F	No
15027	5/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brady, William R	No
15028	5/13/2010	Yes (437151)	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Bowie	No
15029	5/13/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Voglewede, Kay	No
15030	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Owens, George A	No
15031	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Owens, Donna	No
15032	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blue, Josephine M	No
15033	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blue, Josephine M	No
15034	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blue, Josephine M	No
15035	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bracher, Pat	No
15036	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brown Jr., James I	No
15037	5/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eustis, Robert D	No
15038	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hague, Lynn	No
15039	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Holz, Barbara G	No
15040	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Laffoon, Larry	No
15041	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Moore, Stephen C	No
15042	5/13/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Strickland, Charles A	No
15043	5/11/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Southern Environmental Law Center	Carter , Derb	No
15044	5/14/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Turkevich, Leon R	No
15045	5/13/2010	No	Recreational Groups	United Four Wheel Drive Associations, Inc.	Boucher, Carla	No
15046	5/11/2010	No	Civic Groups	Cape Hatteras Business Allies	Swartwood , Judy	No
15047	5/11/2010	No	Civic Groups	Cape Hatteras Business Allies	Goodwin, David	No
15048	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harrison, Thomas G	No
15049	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harrison, Steve	No
15050	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Steiner, Rosemary M	No
15051	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harrison, Steve	No
15052	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Buddenbohn, Tom and Becky	No
15053	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lawson, Dave and Donna	No
15054	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oelschlegel, BJ	No
15055	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Perry, Susie	No
15056	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Couch, John B	No
15057	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Charlet, Sr., James D	No
15058	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eakes, Kara M	No
15059	5/12/2010	No	Non-Governmental	Disability Rights North Carolina	Dolph, Annaliese	No
15060	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Riley, George and Lauria	No
15061	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Hunter	No
15062	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCullough, Martha	No
15063	5/12/2010	No	Civic Groups	Rodanthe-Waves-Salvo Civic Association	Goodloe-Murphy, Mary Helen	No
15064	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fischer, William	No
15065	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burrus, Catherine	No
15066	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Evans, Terrence N	No
15067	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hance, Pete B	No
15068	5/12/2010	Potential (436108)	Business	Hatteras Realty, Inc.	Couch, R. Stewart	No
15069	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Robinson, Liz	No
15070	5/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Emily	No
15071	5/12/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Cape Hatteras Bird Club	Moore, Patricia J	No
15072	5/12/2010	No	County Government	COUNTY OF HYDE	Balance, Gene	No

0008771

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
15073	5/11/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Southern Environmental Law Center	Carter , Derb	No
15074	5/11/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Southern Environmental Law Center	Carter , Derb	No
15075	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarberry , Shannon	No
15076	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harrill, William	No
15077	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Dean	No
15078	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dawson, Dave	No
15079	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Newbold, John	No
15080	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Westervelt , Ernestine	No
15081	4/27/2010	No	Business	Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce	Tine , Paul	No
15082	4/27/2010	No	Town or City Government	Mayor - Kill Devil Hills	Sturza , Raymond	No
15083	4/27/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Surfrider Foundation - Outer Banks Chapter	Walker , Matt	No
15084	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pruett, Matt	No
15085	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Saunders, Ron	No
15086	4/27/2010	No	Recreational Groups	North Carolina Beach Buggy Association	Keene, Jim	No
15087	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tershalk , John	No
15088	5/12/2010	No	State Government	State Environmental Review Clearinghouse	Baggett, Chrys	No
15089	4/27/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Audubon Society - North Carolina	Golder, Walker	No
15090	4/27/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Southern Environmental Law Center	Gisler , Geoff	No
15091	4/27/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Southern Environmental Law Center	Youngman, Julie	No
15092	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Outten, Bobby	No
15093	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Monroe , Joe	No
15094	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Cecil, Regina	No
15095	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham , Larry	No
15096	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Judge, Warren	No
15097	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris , Jim	No
15098	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schawang , Sandra	No
15099	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ray, Jefferson	No
15100	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barker , Doug	No
15101	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Foster , Bill	No
15102	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pauls, Steve	No
15103	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kelly, Sue	No
15104	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shaw, Byron	No
15105	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Larry	No
15106	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shaw , Megan	No
15107	4/27/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Westervelt, Ernestine	No
15108	5/12/2010	No	State Government	NC Department of Administration	Perdue, Beverly E	No
15109	5/17/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kennedy, Anne	No
15110	5/12/2010	No	State Government	Natural Heritage Program	LeGrand, Harry	No
15111	5/12/2010	No	State Government	NC Division of Water Quality	Scheller, Roberto L	No
15112	5/17/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Shade, Betsy	No
15113	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		BROWNING, LEE	No
15114	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		HOLSTEIN, LARRY	No
15115	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		LEH, JIM	No
15116	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		PIERCE, FLEETWOOD	No
15117	4/26/2010	No	Non-Governmental	Republican Party in Dare County	White, Peregrine	No

0008772

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
15118	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		FOSTER, BILL	No
15119	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Browning, Lou	No
15120	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		SCARBOROUGH, RICK	No
15121	4/26/2010	No	Business	Global Surf Network	Beedie, Rob	No
15122	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		N/A, N/A	No
15123	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WILSON, DAVE	No
15124	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		SCHWESTER, GENE	No
15125	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		MEDLIN, KATIE	No
15126	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		PAINTER, JACK	No
15127	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Upton, David	No
15128	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dillon, Carol	No
15129	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DAWSON, RYAN	No
15130	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Barley, Bill	No
15131	4/26/2010	No	Non-Governmental	SGA President of the Cape Hatteras Secondary School	Dunnagan, Brad	No
15132	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ballance, Gene	No
15133	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Blessing, Wayne	No
15134	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		JUDGE, WARREN	No
15135	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		OUTTEN, BOBBY	No
15136	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		CORBETT, CRYSTAL	No
15137	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kennedy, Sharon P	No
15138	4/26/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Audubon Society - North Carolina	Canfield, Chris	No
15139	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Luizer, Virginia	No
15140	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Johnson, Dean	No
15141	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scarborough, David	No
15142	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Couch, John	No
15143	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WILLARD, DANIEL	No
15144	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hardham, Larry	No
15145	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		EAKES, BOB	No
15146	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		MATHIS, WAYNE	No
15147	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Jim	No
15148	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whitaker, Elaine	No
15149	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WHITAKER, ROM	No
15150	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Belter, Bill	No
15151	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Couch, Stewart	No
15152	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		HOOPER, GRANDY	No
15153	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burrus, Jennifer	No
15154	4/26/2010	No	Business	Sea Gull Motel	Oden, Jeff	No
15155	4/26/2010	No	Civic Groups	Cape Hatteras Business Allies	SWARTWOOD, JUDY	No
15156	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lester, Hal	No
15157	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schoolcraft, Kelly	No
15158	4/12/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WEBB, JIMMIE	No
15159	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		James, Freddy	No
15160	4/26/2010	No	Business	Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce	Bennik, Daphne	No
15161	4/26/2010	No	County Government	Hyde County Commissioner	Ballance, Gene	No
15162	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bradley, Scott	No
15163	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Honeycutt, Greg	No
15164	4/26/2010	No	Business	Outer Banks Fishing Pier	Oliver, Gary	No
15165	4/26/2010	No	Non-Governmental	Republican Party for Dare	White, Peregrine	No
15166	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harris, Jim	No
15167	4/26/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Coastal Conservation Association	Mandulak, Bill	No
15168	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chamberlin, George	No
15169	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eshan, David	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
15170	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tyson, Scott	No
15171	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lanier, Leslie	No
15172	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Burke, Tom	No
15173	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Flanagan, Dave	No
15174	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Duke, Cecil	No
15175	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Klinger, Charles	No
15176	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Dimmig, Richard	No
15177	4/26/2010	No	County Government	Dare County Board of Commissioners	Judge, Warren	No
15178	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Outten, Bobby	No
15179	4/26/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Southern Environmental Law Center	Carter, Derb	No
15180	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Harper, Linda	No
15181	4/26/2010	No	Recreational Groups	Recreational Fishing Alliance	O'Connell, Greg	No
15182	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		O'Neal, Vince	No
15183	4/26/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Oelschlegel, Betty J	No
15184	4/26/2010	No	Civic Groups	Civic Business	Austin, Rudy	No
15185	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Graham, David	No
15186	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Lopez, Darren	No
15187	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Gordon, H T	No
15188	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Munden, Willie	No
15189	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rumschlag, Bill	No
15190	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		BEEDIE, ROB	No
15191	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		GIROUX, ROB	No
15192	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		STUBBS, MATTHEW	No
15193	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Wojcik, Robert	No
15194	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nugent, Alfred	No
15195	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Basilone, Bonny	No
15196	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Tripp, Archie	No
15197	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ewell, John	No
15198	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bartlett, Alan	No
15199	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pitts, Chip	No
15200	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Egghart, Chris	No
15201	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Fripp, Jean	No
15202	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Krise, Buddy	No
15203	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Brinkley, Jennifer	No
15204	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Higham, James	No
15205	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Kittrell, Rick	No
15206	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Almond, Scott	No
15207	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Vachet, Dave	No
15208	4/28/2010	No	Recreational Groups	United Mobile Sports Fisherman Association	Quillon, Howard	No
15209	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Scoville, Sheila	No
15210	4/28/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Defenders of Wildlife	Doherty, Peter	No
15211	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Swartwood, Judy	No
15212	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Knicely, Darin	No
15213	4/28/2010	No	Recreational Groups	North Carolina Beach Buggy Association	Joyner, David	No
15214	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Knicely, Christina	No
15215	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		FICKLEN, CARTER	No
15216	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Manschreck, Bill	No
15217	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Styron, Ernie	No
15218	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		JOHNSTON, JAMES	No
15219	4/28/2010	No	Recreational Groups	North Carolina Beach Buggy Association	LARNORE, BOB	No
15220	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		DesRoches, Matt	No

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
15221	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schneirla, Sandy	No
15222	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hayes, Ed	No
15223	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Darges, Jim	No
15224	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		WHITEHEART, RUSTY	No
15225	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Rose, Tom	No
15226	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		HYMAN, DR. GEYSOLYNNE	No
15227	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		HYMAN, ROBERT	No
15228	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Towell, Buster	No
15229	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Bullock, Donna	No
15230	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		YATES, JOHN	No
15231	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		King, Scott	No
15232	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		King, Vickie	No
15233	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McRae, Stuart	No
15234	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Berry, Mike	No
15235	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		McCants, Bernie	No
15236	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nowak, Chris	No
15237	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		BERRYHILL, William	No
15238	4/28/2010	No	County Government	Dare County Board of Commissioners	Judge, Warren	No
15239	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Hales, Jeff	No
15240	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		OUTTEN, BOBBY	No
15241	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Senter, Nancy	No
15242	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Filomena, Tracey	No
15243	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Miller, Reid	No
15244	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Powell, Joe	No
15245	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Walsh, Leon	No
15246	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ballance, Chris	No
15247	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Parker, Kyle	No
15248	4/28/2010	No	Conservation/Preservation	Southern Environmental Law Center	Gisler, Geoff	No
15249	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		MacIntyre, Russ	No
15250	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		ANDERSON, PHILLIP	No
15251	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Schwartz, Melissa	No
15252	4/28/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Idol, Joel	No
15253	5/13/2010	No	Federal Government	Environmental Protection Agency	Mueller, Heinz J	No
15254	5/19/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Pitts, Charles R	No
15255	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Conservation/Preservation	Audubon	Mauguy, eric	No
15256	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Conservation/Preservation	Audubon	Riley, Juna	No
15257	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Litchfield, Kirstin	No
15258	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Kocek, Alison	No
15259	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Futch, David	No
15260	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Conservation/Preservation	Audubon	Smith, Barry	No
15261	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Conservation/Preservation	Audubon	Phillips, Lyn	No
15262	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Pollack, Michael	No
15263	5/11/2010	Yes (422363)	Unaffiliated Individual		Warriner, Vanessa	No
15264	5/13/2010	Yes (438542)	Unaffiliated Individual		Burch, Ken and Connie	No
15265	5/24/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Chamberlin, George	No
15266	5/4/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Phillip	No
15267	5/4/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Danty	No
15268	5/4/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Scott	No
15269	5/4/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Sheila	No
15270	5/4/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Charles	No
15271	5/4/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, Gertrude	No
15272	5/4/2010	Yes (426042)	Unaffiliated Individual		Lewis, James	No
15273	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Ackley, Barbara	No

0008775

Corr ID	Receipt Date	Form Letter	Org Type	Organization	Name	Kept Private
15274	4/29/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Page, Connie M	No
15275	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nelson, Susan G	No
15276	5/3/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Nagele, Elizabeth	No
15277	5/12/2010	Yes (425549)	Unaffiliated Individual		Hawkins Jr, Robert E	No
15278	5/6/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Salber, Ralph	No
15279	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, Robert B	No
15280	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Smith, Theresa	No
15281	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, G	No
15282	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Davis, G	No
15283	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Willard, Daniel J	No
15284	5/11/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Eustis III, Frederic A	No
15285	5/7/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Spencer, Nicola	No
15286	5/10/2010	No	Unaffiliated Individual		Whittaker, Mike	No

0008776

**Correspondence ID:** 1    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** gray, jack  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 11:02:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You know how a computer has a system restore that will take you back in time to fix errors your computer might face. I think that is what should happen to this issue about closing our beaches that I grow up on. lets just go back to that day when one could shake each others hand and the deal was as good as gold, that day when we were told that our beaches would always be open for us,hands were shook and that deal was done. how can people who live in concrete cities where there is not even a blade of grass for a rat to eat thank they need to change our way of life. been to the beach all my life and I have never seen any harm done to any birds by humans. what I have always seen is families and friends having some of the best days ever out there on the beach, never have I seen families and friends harming the wildlife in any way. These people attempting to close our beaches I would like to invite them down for a Sunday afternoon on the beach with my family and friends, grilling burgers, sitting back watching the kids playing in the sand and water, and just relaxing and telling stories, not to mention all the amazing sights and sounds, playing horseshoes, throwing the fresbee , playing catch, surfing, floating, swimming, snorkeling, and I could go on. But my point is none of these activities is harming anything or anybody. We and everybody I know has nothing but a blast out on the beach. every time we leave we pick up all our trash and other trash that we may run across. again I invite anyone to come hang out with us and just try to find something wrong with what we are doing. please don't close our beaches, I have two boys and I would like for them to enjoy the beach as I/We did when we were just little fellers....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hess, Anthony G  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 12:09:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a property owner in Frisco. I find it hard to believe that a well funded special interest group has restricted beach access on Hatteras Island. Please return control of the beaches at CHNS to the rightful parties. We have stopped construction on our lot in Frisco until the beach access problem is resolved one way or the other. Why build a retirement house at the beach if you can't access the beach?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 12:37:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am testing this form.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Smith, Kenneth W  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 13:01:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is Ken Smith. I am a resident of PA but have vacationed in AVON on Hatteras Island for many years. What brought my family to this beautiful place was the freedoms provided to families and fishermen alike. The beach access was a godsend and the array of wildlife and marine life amazing.  
Beach access is an extremely important part of island life. The access keeps shops and family owned businesses alive and open. The economic basis of the island derives a major portion of its revenue from the anglers and families that vacation on the Outer Banks. Without the access to the beaches, my concern is the island will become run down and destitute.  
I am an angler and a father. My hope is for my kids to grow up on the Outer Banks as I did in the summers and they have for the last five years. The beach access is important to my family for a number of reasons. When we go to the beach for the day, we drive out to our spot and park. The kids have the freedom to enjoy nature and everything the ocean has to offer. If they are tired, they nap in the truck. If they need a drink there a cooler close by. If they need shade, we make a tent from the back of the truck like a patio.  
The importance of beach access is not just for my family or the families with young children. What about the veteran that suffered a disabling injury fighting for our freedoms. Removing beach access will remove that very freedom that he fought for. How will that retired soldier gain access to enjoy a day on the beach? He will not and this is a disgrace.  
98% of the vehicle owners and drivers that I have witnessed on the beaches in the Outer Banks, are respectful. We know what we have and we protect it for the future of the beaches. When we see trash, we pick it up. When we see someone in need of help we help them. When we see people begin to become ignorant to the beach and everything it is, we intervene.  
ORV's do not damage the beaches or the habitats of the birds and life that exists here. Our access to the beach is an awarded freedom that all respect and enjoy. It is extremely important to preserve the marine life and wildlife on the beaches, but at the expense of what some families have built. I have met old men on the beach that say that they came to the beaches with nothing and have now built a legacy for their families, whether it be a simple cottage to vacation in or a family owned store and bait shop.  
Removing and extremely limiting the beach access to the Outer Banks beaches is criminal. The beaches are there for everyone placed on the earth to enjoy. No person or group should be afforded the right to decide who can be present on any beach or forrest at any time.  
Beach access is a necessary part of life for the Outer Banks. With the beaches being closed and limited in the past couple of years, I am sure that if anyone is to take a look at the economic reports that generate from the island, they have suffered. In an economy that is already scarred, why further scar and destroy what is here.  
I ask, nay demand, that the beaches of the Outer Banks remain open and available to any person that respectfully and properly feels that they belong there. It is the right of the people to enjoy what has been placed on this earth, and not the right of any group to deny that simplest of human rights.  
My name is Kenneth Smith and I will remain to fight for the access of the Beaches of the Outer Banks. I respectfully thank you for taking time to read my concerns and comments. Beach access is the life blood of a beautiful island and without it, will kill that island and ruin the lives and hard work of people that do not deserve that treatment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 13:37:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Parks were created for all Americans to enjoy. We can share the beauty of the Outer Banks with the wildlife. Beach closure unfairly deprives generations to come access to the very best part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As a native to the area, I cannot imagine being kept off of the beaches by outside interests whatever their good intentions. Please keep the beach open.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 13:54:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a test comment.

**Correspondence ID:** 7    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 13:59:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** in times as hard as these how can a government which claims to have it's citizens best interests at heart even consider enacting rules/laws that will destroy entire economies, communities, and the families that go with them. there are currently many more miles of beaches in the area in question that are closed to orv traffic than are open. we have not complained about these areas that are closed as wildlife refuges because we love all wild life and want to prosper. we have not asked that these areas be opened to orv use. these people and groups are selfishly demanding things that will harm countless individuals and families. my reasons for using these areas is to see and be with the wildlife. please think of and listen to the people that depend on this to earn a living instead of lawyers and groups with no concern for the humans that inhabit these areas.  
i work hard, pay my taxes, and save money all year to be able to use these beaches and see the families and friends that have made it thier home. i know that i am not alone when i say that my faith that our government has the best interests of its people in mind has already been deeply eroded over th years. if the the country that i love so dearly has leaders that turn their backs on entire communities by bowing to these unreasonable pressures, i really dont know if i will have any faith left. our government for the people is turn out to be "for the birds" truly, truly sad.

**Correspondence ID:** 8    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Crider, Ruth  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 14:54:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I moved down to NC a few years ago with the hopes of my children and grandchildren being able to enjoy the beach as much as I do when they come to visit me. It is a shame that the new laws will close access to the beaches. It is the little enjoyment that people can afford now days. Why would you do this? People can live in harmony with nature with out closing the beaches.

**Correspondence ID:** 9    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mattingly, Mike  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 15:21:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please find below, Letter To The Editor, printed on July 9th, 2009 in the Outer Banks Sentinel. A local newspaper on the Outer Banks of North Carolina.  
[Preserve Beach Access.org](http://www.preservebeachaccess.org)  
Above, are three words, with an abbreviation attached.We as Americans need to realize, these three words could be included in our stories, to our, future generations.These three words could be part of our generation's effort to protect our freedom for our children, family, friends and way beyond the shores of Hatteras Island, on the Outer Banks of North Carolina.Today is July 5th, the day after our entire nation celebrated our country's freedom. I was one of the very fortunate Americans to, enjoy this fourth of July with my grandchildren and my family.We started our day by going to our beautiful beaches to collect shells with our grandchildren. To enjoy the spectacular day, sitting on our favorite beach, swimming, building sandcastles, writing our names in the sand and telling many happy stories.There was a very, heartfelt, sad point, at the beginning of our day though. As we began to cross the Oregon Inlet Bridge, going south, there were no Americans or any of our friends from other countries celebrating this day, no families, no children, no sandcastles in the sand, not one story being told -- there was nothing -- nothing at all.Reason being -- special environmental groups have filed a lawsuit against the National Park Service and the National Park Service -- thru no fault of its own has been forced to close some of our beaches.Oh, There was something there, but it wasn't on the beach it was in our hearts -- it was sadness. It was as if someone said we are cutting you off from everything -- that's the way it's going to be no matter how it affects any of you.We all remember when Hatteras was literally cut off from the rest of the world. The island was cut off because the ocean ripped thru the road that connected our neighbors and friends to the rest of us. Hurricane Isabel created devastating effects on Hatteras Island.What did we do? We came together as friends as neighbors as volunteers as government as people coming together to help each other, connecting the link again and re-building, there lives and there crushed economy. We came together. We all helped.Hatteras, has another devastating hurricane coming thru destroying their very being, a category 5 environmental hurricane. A hurricane that will wipe them off the map if we don't come together and say we've had enough and we are going to stop this very sad disaster.When the symbol of our country, the American Bald Eagle, was on the verge of extinction, we didn't close down Yellowstone National Park. When Condor's were in trouble with their survival, we didn't close the Grand Canyon.What did we do? We all came together, we nurtured them, we protected them, we relocated their eggs and chicks. We helped them survive and survive they did.Hopefully, I speak for most of us. We all want to help animals and wildlife survive. Let's all help do this -- let's relocate eggs and chicks, let the experts move nests. We don't want to. We ask you to accomplish this wonderful task -- you're the experts.For God's sake, in the process, please use some common sense. Please don't eliminate us and our lifestyle and our future generations celebration of freedom.Are the words PRESERVE BEACH ACCESS.ORG important to us?You bet your sweet life they are. Most of all, you bet your American freedom, they are extremely, important.[www.preservebeachaccess.org](http://www.preservebeachaccess.org)Please, we need your help now.Thank You So Much For Your SupportProud to be an American With Common SenseProud to live on the Outer Banks and Help Our Neighbors on Hatteras Island  
Mike Mattingly Outer Banks

**Correspondence ID:** 10    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Thorn, Adrian  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 15:56:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow as much ORV access to CHNSRA as promised, when the people who live there gave up the land they owned to create this park.There is no reason for the expanded buffers and closures in the park.No other beach allows such a large area to be closed for a small bird that benefits from being near people.The lack of access to the beach for handicap or disabled people is illegal.A small number of park and walk areas,plus oceanfront houses makes most of the park impossible for people to get to without ORV access.If there was more ramps and a road connecting them, it would allow more access and still protect nesting areas.The ban on night driving on the beach should be flexible enough to allow ORV on the beach after dark and still protect turtles.This could be accomplished by allowing ORV to remained parked after dark on all open areas. The most popular spots, cape point,south point and others should have a small corridor to allow limited traffic after dark.If there is no way to allow night traffic, then camping overnight at the popular fishing spots should be permitted.I love to visit the OBX but have not visited since the Consent Decree took effect because of the difficulty of access for my disabled and very young family members.I look forward to returning as soon as this mess is resolved, until then I hope for a solution that allows access the best surf fishing in the world.

**Correspondence ID:** 11    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 16:39:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Concerning the limitation on ORV usage and impact to the ecosystem on the Outer Banks. Policies of the NPS and the corresponding judicial decisions governing usage of the Beachfront by NC citizens are a violation of NC Residents ownership of public lands and their ability to decide usage and the coincident limitation or non limitation. All decisions concerning this land area should be determined by state residents in which the land is loacted. Allowing outside, non resident parties to further their agenda is travesty and a violation of our civil rights. The negative economic impact to the local

economy and the restrictions to NC Residents of the use of our own property should not be allowed. Please return this area to the State of NC Residents and remove the protection of a bird that has many places to live and where anecdotal and scientific evidence is at the minimum tainted by opinion and at the most totally false. Our tax dollars should be spent putting people to work, not wasted protecting a bird which flourishes elsewhere and is not proven to be in NC for any lengthy period of time. The entire piping plover saga is a shining example of judicial overreach and the downfall and removal of state's and individual rights.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,12,2010 16:58:55						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Why not just charge an access fee (seasonal, monthly, weekly and daily) make it steep enough to discourage the curious. Issue decals, patrol the beach and right large fines for violations. This would pay for the patrol effort, provide additional revenue to maintain ramps and other beach maintenance items and most importantly reduce the volume of traffic on the beach.</p> <p>Today a monster home on the beach can have 5-8 SUV's parked at it and they usually walk out on the beach behind their house, but usually 1 or 2 days of their rental they ALL drive out on another beach "for the fun of it". If the fee was high enough, maybe they'd leave a few SUV's home.</p> <p>The turtle nests and bird nests can still be marked but the impact of the markings would be less severe because the volume would be less.</p> <p>Locals could be provided a significant discount to the fee structure.</p> <p>Today, the roped off protected areas, because of the high volumes, creates more damage because of the severe concentration. Man and Wildlife can co-exist on the Island, as they have for 400 years, you just need to manage the volume...not create rules to completely close access.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Scearce, David N						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,12,2010 17:51:14						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>My family has been going to Ocracoke for 10+ years. The last few we have had to deal with beach closures. We have been told it is due to enviromental reasons that effect wildlife.Even with the closures the beaches are not crowded(peak season). I don't understand how a few vehicles on the beach can effect birds. We see the turtle nesting areas roped off and we don't want to disturb the nest nor have we seen anyone else bother them.It is public land and it should be accessable to all as long as they obey the rules.Open the beaches back up and don't give in to enviromentalist pressure to follow their agenda.</p> <p>David Scearce, Wise, Va</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	14	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,13,2010 07:55:31						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>To Who it may concern:, I've been visting the Outer Banks for over thirty years and travel there several time a year to enjoy the beaches of North Carolina.I love to fish and spend time with my family there. Its most important for me to have access to the beaches by truck to get my elderly mother and aunt to the beach they love. Please keep our beaches open. Someone the humans! Thank you Troy Louis</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	15	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,13,2010 08:35:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Let's move our attention away from total inaccessibility and venture towards responsible accessibility.</p> <p>It is time to open the beaches.</p> <p>My family and I have been regular guests at Ocracoke for over 15 years. We are respectful of the wildlife and have developed a deep appreciation for the multitude of species, especially the sea turtles and piping plovers. When the beaches were open, my children did school reports on the piping plovers, taking pictures and sharing information of their endangerment with their teachers and fellow students.</p> <p>Having such significant portions of the beaches closed has severely impacted our vacation experience, from daily walks where we observe and study the wildlife to occasional fishing. Closing the beaches is taking away what the park service is truly about!</p> <p>Rather than closing beaches, resources should be geared towards education for the protection of wildlife. There is a captive audience of people arriving on the island -- they can only get there by ferry (over 99% of the people)or private plane. Initiatives should be made towards education.</p> <p>THE FERRY SERVICES SHOULD HAVE EDUCATIONAL VIDEOS PLAYING ON THE TELEVISIONS EXPLAINING PRESERVATION MEASURES AND FINES FOR NOT FOLLOWING GUIDELINES.</p> <p>FLYERS SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED TO EACH VEHICLE ENTERING THE FERRY WITH EXPLANATION OF PUNITIVE FINES AS WELL AS EDUCATION ON PROTECTING THE BEACHES AND WILDLIFE.</p> <p>FERRY WORKERS AND PARK RANGERS SHOULD TALK WITH GUESTS, PROVIDE PROGRAMMING, AND CREATE AN OVERALL CAMPAIGN TOWARDS RESPONSIBILITY.</p> <p>The majority of reidents and guests are respectful of the needs of wildlife. Ocracoke residents and private organizations have always been willing to volunteer to help preservation activities. Certainly they will again be willing to walk the beaches, assist with education and enforcement, and help assure wildlife safety.</p> <p>Closing the beaches is a short term solution, without long term results. Opening the beaches, teaching guests and residents of preservation needs, leads to long term societal behavioral changes.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	16	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	besemann, klaus d						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,13,2010 09:16:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear PEPC,</p> <p>Have been a regular visitor to Outer Banks for over 20 years. Enjoy beach activities in Buxton area.</p> <p>The possibility of limiting access to beach is unthinkable regardless of your stated proposed policy. This is America not some communist state that controls everyone and everything.</p> <p>Keep your hands off of our seashores and related properties!!</p> <p>Klaus D. Besemann</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	17	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,13,2010 10:14:46						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						

**Correspondence:**

Mr. Murray, I know you and your staff have put in countless hours dealing with all of the requirements mandated on the Park Service and I personally appreciate the hard work. That said, I can only hope that your work does not result in the total closure of the beach to all but a few bird watchers and homeowners. I consider myself a steward of the environment and take the issue seriously. I've helped clean the beach, I've called in reports to rangers when I've seen abuses on the beach, myself and others I fish and vacation with make sure we follow all rules and regulations and we leave the beach cleaner than before we got there. We do not harm any creatures while there and do our best to make sure those around us don't either. The organizations I belong to have championed the very things I described above and will continue to do so as long as I'm a member. I will not stoop to name calling and tit for tat with the groups that have sued the Park Service because it does nothing to further the dialog needed to accomplish your mandate. It seems to me that prior to the lawsuit, you had things well under hand and all that was needed was a formal document stating the Park Service's due diligence in maintaining both an environmental and recreational balance within the Cape Hatteras Seashore. It also seems to me that everything that has been done since the ruling (closing large portions of the beach to pedestrians and fishermen) has resulted in the same or fewer birds being hatched, the killing or relocating of hundreds of other animals and the lost of numerous livelihoods to the people who make their home on the island. After all of this, it would seem that the Park Service had it right to begin with and the logical result would be to remove control of the park from the Judge and return it to your group. The Judge may have had the right to force the Service to finish the process but he has punished the Park Service enough. I employ you to take back control of your park and use your common and proven scientific sense to maintain a good balance for both the environmental and recreational users of the Seashore. To the groups that sued your Park, saving birds is a noble endeavor and I agree. But education and enforcement will accomplish as much if not more than expanded closures and at what cost. I know you and your staff are familiar with the rule of Unintended Consequences (UC). We try to accomplish one thing that someone says is needed and find out that by doing so a different group is harmed. In the Park Services case, you have maintained the numbers of a certain species but we have killed other animals to do so(UC). Another, you close the beaches to improve the numbers of a certain species. I love the beach and 8-10 of us have been coming down 3 times a year (spring,fall and winter) to fish. I spend another week with the family (summer)and this has been going on for years. Last fall, we brought 7 down to fish, this spring (May 15th) there will only be 6 of us. The compelling reason for the drop, they got tired and frustrated with having to drive around and hunt for places to fish because of beach closures(UC). This summer, we will vacation in Pawley's Island(UC) because of beach closures. It is now your job to determine what the Cape Hatteras Seashore will be in the future. Will it be a Recreational Park (like it was set out to be)or will it become a bird sanctuary like Pea Island and False Cape Park (VA.). I wish you the knowledge of Solomon in your decision because a lot of people will be affected by it. My hopes are that my grandchildren and I will be able to fish there the rest of our lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 18    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Mar,13,2010 13:41:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a US citizen I would like to comment on the Draft OVR Management Plan/EIS for the Outer Banks. I have no vested interest, that is, I am not a resident or even a frequent visitor to the region in question. My interest as a citizen relates to my combined interest in birding (watcher, feeder, Audubon member) and fisherman, hiker and cyclist. I have confidence in the trained wildlife management professionals at the National Park Service to manage our public lands to maximize public use for education, sport and recreation and at the same time insure the safety of wildlife and it's habitat. After reading the various alternatives,I feel that alternative F provides for the most reasonable mix of environmental protection and public use. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 19    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** Mar,13,2010 14:25:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have vacationed at Cape Hatteras for 30 years. Please keep the beach open for my grandchildren and great grandchildren.My mother's ashes were scattered there and I return every year to honor her. I hope some day to have my children scatter my ashes here. It is really God's place and man's restrictions should not close this beautiful place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 20    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Shircliff, Robert

**Received:** Mar,13,2010 15:11:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Superintendent Robinson, (If you knew what a pitiful tyest I am you would have a special appreciation for this responce.) I was impressed by the sheer scope of this document. I know how controversial it is and how difficult it must be to try to satisfy everyone in this process. I resent the efforte of those who have forced the restrictions which are being imposed on this park more than the restrictions themselves. On one hand it is easy to be on the side of conservation. It is a heartbreak on the other hand ,that this place, which represents a great sabatian of freedom to so many, will be reduced to an area with so many " rules ". I was a young man at 19 laying on a dune facing the ocean watching a meteor shower of epic portions when I first felt that "feeling". It was as if all cosmic energy...sea, sky ,stars ,wind, moon ,sun,storm,wave,current all converging in one spot. Cape Point congered thoughts of the high seas and conquest... of great creatures and stories that could only be told by the dead. The wonderment that it stirred up in me was almost universal to those with whom I shared this place. My children all were moved from an early age. Katie ,at the age of 12 ,commented to me after returning from vacation at Duck with family friends," Dad , I don't like going to OBX without you ". " Why?, I asked ". " They just don't get it ". There are those that know the " secret" to the Banks is to be on the beach in a vehicle. To witness the scope of the shore and what it reveals you need to cover ground. A pod of porpoises there,a group of diving Gannets here,a flock of Skimmers working the wash.It is a pity that with all the habitat Plymouth Island ,Core Banks,Cape lookout,Bald Head,The marshs of Delmarve, etc. that offers little access to man ,much less by vehicle. that we need to restrict Man's access here. This does not preclude you from following an executive order I know,however it is a shame that we are in this position. It is especially a heartbreak to those individuals who are without the resources to " see the world" For them the experience here puts them on an even plane. They are angry and not very well understood. These individuals do not have much of a voice,at least not as loud as Audubon. So... as unpopular as this is you need to be ther voice. The Park Service has a difficult task I know but you must do what you most to insure that this Park remains open to those that marvel in it the way that I do... that my kids do. The park has been a class room for them ,that they would never have had ,were we not able to access the beach by an SUV. If a permit which requires an test along with instruction is required, then so be it. If a fee for a yearly permit to provide for resorce protection ,then so be it. If a restriction for limited access for an area behind the Point be required, then so be it. But closed to SUV... NO! I was hunting seashells along a strand near the "hook" last weekend when a group of Plovers were trotting by me at arms length. We were co-existing. They were my companions... my little friends. I will afford them some space behind me when I fish at the point. I will not allow my yellow lab " Little Miss Hateres " to run free into their nesting areas. And as usual, I will wipe the tears from my Grand childrens eyes as the Gulls carry away their hapless chicks as I did for my own wee ones. I do resent you killing my River Otters. If I saw one of your officers attemp to kill one ,I would do what I could to stop them with the promise of arrest.You need to stop that. They are not like a Fox,a coon,or a opossum. They do not populate as quickly. I do hope you are driven by a moral purpose and push back. You need to find some middle ground. This has the liklyhood of ending badly otherwise. All men are not rational. I myself feel the anger. I can't imangine how I would feel if I made my living down there. I have great empathy for them. As you have by now discovered I spell poorly. It is the middle ground you must find and if after you have done so ... let the court case begin. Will you be my Ranger please? Sincerly R.G. Shircliff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 21    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Shircliff, Robert

**Received:** Mar,13,2010 19:10:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I commented earlier but realised I forgot the most important thing. People deserve a park too. I am an endangered species..., A free American? Alternative A and a U.S. Park Service with gonads..., that is my preference.

**Correspondence ID:** 22    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Eichinger, Edward G  
**Received:** Mar,13,2010 23:05:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please make this prohibited. In areas that are deemed sanctioned for ORV [in case my objection to total ban on any ORV in non-designated areas does not stand] make the access extremely limited with heavy fines for violators. Listen up because here is the Gods' honest truth! People think that their activities in the wild are benign. Until we come to grips with our selfishness, wild animals, plant life, and habitat will continue to dwindle and extinctions will be our sad legacy. Our decedents will look upon our way of life as heartless and evil. Examples; in Antarctica humans have 'studied' the penguin and tagged them in the interest of science for the last 40 years. With no respect to the fragility of the habitat people have left footprints in an environment that had no such influence for over 20 million years. Now the penguins are disappearing at alarming rates. We cannot ignore what changes our presence brings. In Florida and other parts of the world dolphins are beaching themselves and dying every year in varying numbers. These are the most intelligent marine creatures and we have ruined their lively-hood with sewage runoffs and leaching plastics. The runoffs bring chemicals that change the pH of the coastal waters where they hunt for food and the plastics break down into different types of pseudo-hormones that destroy the ability of their prey to reproduce. They have been trying to tell us for years. By beaching themselves they are attempting to get our attention. They are saying they have no future. They are giving the ultimate sacrifice. They need us to stop polluting their habitat. In Alaska people want to drill for oil. They say that the impact on the environment will be minimal. Well we do not need any more fossil fuel in the atmosphere. One truck tire track is too many in the great national parks of the North. As the ice cap melts methane escapes at ever increasing rates. We may see exponential global warming way sooner than anyone imagined. The Outer Banks will be submerged. It matters not how long this will take. We need to observe the finite capacities of our Biosphere now. We need to set and be examples for future generations and societies now. If it were up to me there would be no Off Road Vehicles at all, allowed anywhere. I mean from Virginia Dare Bridge to southern tip end of Ocracoke Island. I say if you want to drive down to the beach you have to park on or near the road and walk your belongings in on foot. The simple fact that people can drive onto the beach means they can carry more, and the more they carry, the more potential for catastrophe. Again; Please make this prohibited. In areas that are deemed sanctioned for ORV [in case my objection to total ban on any ORV in non-designated areas does not stand] make the access extremely limited with heavy fines for violators. Thank you, Eldest Son of the Eichinger family, North Beach,[near Waves, N.C.] Ed Eichinger "What lies behind us and what lies before us are small matters compared to what lies within us." --Ralph Waldo Emerson

**Correspondence ID:** 23    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Mar,14,2010 16:46:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was raised in North Carolina.. Went to the Beach often.. And plan on coming back... I do not know what IDIOT Wants to keep people off the beach... Guess he thinks he is GOD!! God made that beach and he made it for people. The only and I do mean ONLY thing these so called Conservacionest do is piss people off and cost more money!!!Liberals do love to spend other peoples money, and this sound to me like that is what this... Some low life trying to make a name for himself.. A "hay, look at me" sorta of person. Tell them to take a long walk off a short pier!!!

**Correspondence ID:** 24    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Mar,15,2010 06:50:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having visited, lived and worked at CAHA beginning in the late 70's, I have observed a drastic increase in OHV use, and decrease in shorebirds, shorebird nesting success, and the general health of the natural system. I like to drive the beach and to the point, but I would rather have a semi-intact "natural" beach than to have the privilege of driving everywhere on the beach with the obvious negative impact to the coastal wildlife. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is part of the National Park Service. Its one of the few Land Management Agencies that was created to protect these public lands. Other land management agencies are much more "multiple use" and offer the motorized recreational user the type of recreation that they seek. The NPS should be, and is different. I vote for very limited motorized use of CAHA, or no motorized use, with the main emphasis on providing wildlife habitat and maintaining a non-motorized "National Park" feeling. Even if I have to walk, or if I am physically unable to walk, or don't have any access, it would be nice to know that the natural system is there and semi-intact. Thank you for your effort on this. Bill Munsey

**Correspondence ID:** 25    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Mar,15,2010 08:24:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I like to drive the beach and to the point, but I would rather have a semi-intact "natural" beach than to have the privilege of driving everywhere on the beach with the obvious negative impact to the coastal wildlife. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is part of the National Park Service. Its one of the few Land Management Agencies that was created to protect these public lands. Other land management agencies are much more "multiple use" and offer the motorized recreational user the type of recreation that they seek. The NPS should be, and is different. I vote for very limited motorized use of CAHA, or no motorized use, with the main emphasis on providing wildlife habitat and maintaining a non-motorized "National Park" feeling. Even if I have to walk, or if I am physically unable to walk, or don't have any access, it would be nice to know that the natural system is there and semi-intact.

**Correspondence ID:** 26    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rennie, Scott  
**Received:** Mar,15,2010 09:15:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have visited the Cape Hatteras National Seashore RECREATION Area twice a year for fishing vacations for the past 25 years. The last couple of years I have ceased to visit the Park in the summer due to the uncertainty of beach closures. If the closure issue is not soon resolved in favor of restored access to the beaches, I will no longer make the twelve hour drive to visit the Park. It is simply not possible to enjoy fishing recreation in a RECREATION AREA that has closed the most popular fishing areas. I urge the adoption of the positions outlined in the "Coalition for Beach Access, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area, ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement, March 5, 2010". This document promotes a reasonable balance to access and protection of wildlife. The NPS must take into account ALL users of the park. The NPS must NOT simply take the easy way out and close the most popular areas because it is too difficult to develop a management plan for all park users. There is surely a way to allow access to the Park shoreline while still protecting wildlife. The NPS needs to manage this RECREATION AREA for RECREATION! This park is not a wildlife refuge to be closed to all but the privileged, sophisticated experts.

**Correspondence ID:** 27    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Doerr-Martin, Kimberely  
**Received:** Mar,15,2010 09:52:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have written and posted on various sites, etc- so i will TRY to keep this short. My Dad and Brother & families live in Avon,NC (affectionatly known as OBX) and as with most residents will be more than negatively affected by this action! I would call it devastated!!! I was there last year and could not believe the chaos of just trying to get on the beach to fish in a LEGAL area. The postings are very unclear and moved around daily!!! Seems to me that if a whole species (PIPING PLOVER) is to be protected then why not have an educated person manufacture CLEAR, CONCISE, signage that leaves nothing to ponder! I finally get on the beach to fish and had to answer 1 million questions from kids that wanted to fish,etc and others who just wanted to walk to the point! Asking ME where they were allowed to walk, etc! WOW!! I couldn't understand. So I came back to Pa and started to look into the much protected plover, to find that not only are they not endangered they are not INDIGENOUS to Cape Hatteras. They can be found up and down the coast and apparently MIGRATE!!! Am I missing something here??? Seriously on one hand an entire economy vs a non indigenous bird, Are you kidding me? One last thought...In one of my previous visits to the Beach access site a guy that is from Hatteras was upset that everyone kept talking about the economy of the island, instead of the "quality of Life" to residents, to me if your broke, jobless and homeless or have a beach access home you cannot sell because you cant GO ON THE BEACH!!! Quality of life is a misnomer. I guess we could just convert them to BIRDHOUSES!! Thank you for the space Kimberely Doerr-Martin

**Correspondence ID:** 28    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Mar,15,2010 12:13:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** During the firestorm that has erupted since the Consent Decree was signed, the term ORV has become a catchall for any party wishing to access the seashore. Pedestrian access should not be covered under any part of the ORV Management plan. ORV stands for Off-Road Vehicle, not pedestrian. The science of pedestrian impact on the seashore should not be lumped into the science of ORV impact. The Consent Decree was signed by environmental groups, attempting to uphold the law that ORV's should not be admitted on the seashore without a management plan, and a group of ORV access defenders. The Consent Decree contained language that also covered management of pedestrians, and the ORV groups sold their soul to sign this document so they could keep driving on the beach, at the expense of pedestrian access. Please do not continue this horrendous oversight. Please remove all portions of the Draft ORV Management Plan that references and restricts pedestrians. This plan is not the place for it. Feel free to work up a Draft Pedestrian Management plan independently. Restricting large areas of a National Seashore to ORV's is one thing, if there is determined to be a negative impact, but restricting individual citizens on foot from visiting these areas is against everything the park stands for. Particularly the areas that are under consideration for being closed. Closing Cape Point at CHNSRA to all access would be akin to closing access to Old Faithful at Yellowstone, El Capitan at Yosemite, the North Rim at Grand Canyon, and even more closely to closing Mt. Rainier at Mt. Rainier NP. You simply cannot close the park's name sake (Cape Hatteras Point) to visitation. Thank you for your consideration.  
Carlton Blanks

**Correspondence ID:** 29    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Mar,15,2010 13:36:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the EIS for Cape Hatteras National Seashore's ORV Management Plan. My comments are below in CAPS and where possible, refer to a page number or section of the document.  
GENERAL COMMENTS:  
1. UNDER NEPA, IT WOULD SEEM THAT "ACTION" ALTERNATIVES SHOULD BE COMPARED TO THE NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVES. ESTIMATES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS CAN ONLY BE DETERMINED BY DOING SO.  
2. I CANNOT FIND ANY MENTION OF PLANS ON HOW TO DEAL WITH CURRENT PERMITEES (GUIDES, SCHOOLS, ETC.) THAT OPERATE IN THE PARK AND HOW THEIR PERMITS WILL BE MESHED OR CONSIDERED WITH NEWLY REQUIRED VEHICLE PERMITS.  
FOR EXAMPLE, MY PARTNER AND I OPERATE 3 FISHING SCHOOLS EACH YEAR MOSTLY FISHING BEACHES IN THE PARK. WE WILL HAVE 12-25 PEOPLE IN EACH CLASS AND WE USHER 10-15 VEHICLES ON AND OFF THE BEACH FOR 1-2 DAYS DURING EACH PROGRAM. WILL EACH OF THESE VEHICLES BE REQUIRED TO PURCHASE A PERMIT? WE CURRENTLY PAY THE NPS \$200.00 PER YEAR TO OPERATE IN THE PARK- AND HAVE DONE SO FOR 4-5 YEARS- ONE OF THE FEW BUSINESSES TO DO SO I BELIEVE. TO REQUIRE OUR PARTICIPANTS TO PURCHASE VEHICLE PERMITS OVER AND ABOVE THE PERMIT WE NOW PURCHASE SEEMS EXCESSIVE.  
I WOULD SUGGEST THAT YOU ALLOW US TO OPERATE AND OUR STUDENTS TO FISH UNDER OUR EXISTING BUSINESS PERMIT. WE COULD BE ISSUED PERMANENT REARVIEW MIRROR PERMITS FOR DISTRIBUTION TO OUR STUDENTS. WE COULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING SURE THEY KNOW AND ABIDE BY PARK RULES. WE COULD PROVIDE NECESSARY TRAINING IN OUR CLASSROOM SESSION.  
AT THE VERY LEAST, YOU MUST ACKNOWLEDGE AND HAVE SOME PLAN FOR ACCOMODATING THOSE STUDENTS FISHING UNDER OUR "USE PERMIT." FURTHERMORE, LIKE COMMERCIAL FISHERS, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT OUR OPERATION NOT BE SUBJECT TO LIMITED ACCESS PROVISIONS BEING CONSIDERED.  
SPECIFIC COMMENTS:  
COMMENT 1: CURIOUSLY, BASED ON THE TABLES ILLUSTRATING PIPING PLOVER HISTORICAL ABUNDANCE, (Tables 14-24) IT APPEARS THAT HIGHER DENSITIES AND FLEDGLING SUCCESS OCCURRED DURING PERIODS OF HIGHER ORV USE (1990s).  
COMMENT 2: Page 210- "At other sites, it was documented that fledging success did not differ between areas with and without recreational ORV use (Patterson et al. 1991), although pedestrians caused a decrease in brood foraging behavior in New Jersey (Burger 1994)." OTHER STUDIES SUGGEST THAT HUMAN PRESENCE AFFECTS BIRDS. EVIDENCE IS NEITHER CLEAR NOR CONVINCING THAT ORV USE NEGATIVELY AFFECTS PIPING PLOVER BEHAVIOR OR BREEDING SUCCESS. YOU CANNOT SIMPLY CHOOSE TO ACCEPT ONE STUDY WHILE IGNORING OR DISREGARDING ANOTHER- NOT WITHOUT SOME JUSTIFICATION.  
COMMENT 3: FIRST LET ME SAY THAT I AM VERY MUCH IN FAVOR OF ADEQUATE PROTECTION OF ANY SPECIES THAT IS IN TROUBLE (ENDANGERED, THREATENED OR LISTED). BUT IF WE ARE DEPENDENT ON PIPING PLOVER SUCCESS AT CAHA TO BRING THIS POPULATION OUT OF ENDANGERED STATUS, WE (OR RATHER THE BIRDS) WOULD APPEAR TO BE IN BIG TROUBLE. THE NUMBERS USING THE AREA NOW AS WELL AS HISTORICALLY, ARE INSIGNIFICANTLY LOW. IF THIS IS IN FACT TRUE, YOU SEEM TO BE GOING TO GREAT EXTREMES FOR VERY LITTLE GAIN.

**Correspondence ID:** 30    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wilkinson, Lori C  
**Received:** Mar,15,2010 17:46:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This issue has been a cause of great distress to me and my family. We have been enjoying vacationing on Hatterass Island and Ocracoke Island for the last decade, and the main reason is that we are able to drive onto the beach and enjoy a full day out on the beach. My father is not able to walk on the

beach because of severe arthritis, but by driving on the beach, he can enjoy the beach with the rest of us. Also, the Outer Banks residents and visitors have kept the beaches natural and clean (cleaner than any other beach I have been to) regardless of the fact that more people have been vacationing in this area. The idea of preventing ORV access, but building walk ways and ramps to the beach, is destroying the natural environment more. As to the issue of the birds and turtles, no one who goes to the beach attempts to interfere with the natural activities of any animal on the island. We must remember that we humans are part of the ecological system as well. The idea of natural selection has been ignored. No species on earth is designed to continue for eternity. Species evolve to adapt to the living environment, and species die off when they can no longer survive. This is a natural part of life. While humans affect the earth, so does the earth affect us. We who love and enjoy the Outer Banks do so because we enjoy the natural environment, the birds, the turtles, and even the foxes and other natural bird predators (which have been killed to protect the birds). This human interaction also affects the birds and their life cycle. I also take issue that this is a vacation spot for the working class person. It is affordable for those of us that cannot travel out of the country or spend the summer in the Hamptons. I find it interesting that this recreational beach has been targeted. On the issue of economics, restricting ORV access to the beach will severely affect the livelihoods of business owners, owners, and residents in the Outer Banks because those of us that vacation here because of the ORV access will no longer vacation here and spend our money. This will also negatively affect the entire economic position of the state of North Carolina in the form of decreased sales taxes and decreased income of the citizens. I cannot believe that the Audobon society and environmentalists have this much power to so greatly negatively affect the lives of millions of people. It scares me to think what will happen next. When is anyone going to listen to the pleas of the residents and visitors of the Outer Banks? No one appears to even consider what we are saying, or care that the lives of these people will forever be changed for the worse. Ultimately, it is the residents that should determine their own destiny and how best to utilize their community to serve themselves and others.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 31    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Mar,15,2010 18:10:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our family supports eliminating driving on the beach during the primary nesting and fledgling period.

The Park Service Service is required under the Endangered Species Act to protect and restore the habitat of Threatened and Endangered Species. This county is built on the rule of law. Failure to comply with the Endangered Species Law would be arbitrary and capricious.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 32    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Mar,15,2010 18:51:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I would like to state that after reading the report, I do not agree with the DEIS. The closed areas are considerably larger than that of last year. And why? I don't see the amount of birds increasing on the beach. They are however, thriving quite well, in the sound on manmade "islands". Where I might add, the conditions are ideal from washover and direct hurricane hits. We have already felt the impact of what these closures have done for the seasonal retailers/restaurants/mom & pop shops, in our area. Many visitors have stated that they would not come back to vacation here if the beaches continued with closures. Many of these same people are in their elder years and have been coming here to vacation on the beach year after year, but will consider other venues if they have no drivable access on the beach. Some of these people are disabled and can't maneuver themselves over walkways or around dunes. Many are Veteran's young and old who are disabled. And what about the folks whose spouses or care providers who cannot maneuver those in their care due to their own disabilities? I don't believe the report considered or inquired with these folks!

I have witness my own seasonal hours decrease considerably since the beach closures. Two positions that I count on to get me through the winter, came to a standstill with a much shorter season of employment. I have asked customers over the past year and some, how they felt about beach closures and their responses are overwhelming. If they can't fish and get all their family members on the beach, then why come here?

The results of the beach closures have been disastrous. Many folks I know have moved away since the beach closures because their jobs dissolved.

And if these same people can't fish to put so much as food on their table what alternative do they have to stay here?

There is nothing in the report that addresses TCP's. Is that to say that there is no cultural or historic input that has made these areas what they became on Hatteras and Ocrakoke? How can this be true?

I embrace what I know about this area. I moved for the lifestyle to fish and drive on the beach as I have asthma and in the summer, it is impossible for me, despite medication, to walk any distance, without suffering an attack. I AM A TAXPAYER and a CONTRIBUTOR TO MY COMMUNITY. I have volunteered on beach clean up at Ramp 4 and Cocino Beach. I have picked up litter, in my area and nearby, ever time I am on the beach. I buy sandwiches, gas and fishing supplies from 3 different mom & pop shops everytime I go drive and fish on the beach.

I don't believe the Park Service is doing right by me or my neighboring brothers and sisters in this matter. I don't feel that we THE PEOPLE are being heard and listened to. I just hope the special interest groups involved in this matter are moving to live here soon, so they can support the remaining mom & pops and their families. I also can't wait to see the special interests volunteer for beach clean-ups.

I do however, thank you, for this opportunity, Ali Kerekes member NCBBA, FOE 4506 Outer Banks-Aux Secretary (2 yrs), Stakeholders Committee - Kill Devil Hills, Past Vice President Avalon Beach Improvement Association (2 consecutive terms)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 33    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Harvey, James R

**Received:** Mar,15,2010 20:30:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

July 7, 1977. My older brother brought me to Cape Hatteras NC for the first time. It was magical for a 12 year old. I'd always had to walk across a hot boardwalk at a filthy dirty place like Ocean City, MD. or Colonial Beach, VA. We had to drag chairs, blankets and a cooler over burning sand and get our shoes filled with sand as well.

Suddenly, here I am in a magical place. We drive right up to the waters edge. We leave the cooler in the truck. We wave at all of the fisherman and surfers slowly passing by in their trucks or Jeeps. The Park Rangers come up and chat us up while carefully checking that we are picking up after ourselves and generally just behaving. For a young boy, it is a fantasy land. There are plenty of birds around running into the sea pecking at the sand. My brother calls them plovers but I just think they are silly little things.

I continued to come each year with my brother and camp at the Park Service campground by the lighthouse. After I turned 16, I began going down on my own with friends and girlfriends. Always, it was a wonderful and exciting time, each and every trip. And, as always, those little birds were there running up to the waters edge and pecking at the sand. Plovers, always lots of plovers.

Well, I have continued to come at least once but usually twice a year since 1977 and only in 2008 did anything change. There was a sense of urgency and panic to all of the faces I'd come to know since I was a kid. They all seemed shell shocked and depressed. As I was made aware of the situation of impending beach access restrictions and possible closures. And for what? A bird that still has just as many little ones scampering around the waters edge as I have seen for the last 33 years. I ran into ropes and signs telling me I could no longer go to my favorite area of the beach via the route I have used since 1977. I had to go around because their nests are in danger from our vehicles. However, in 33 years of visits I have seen not one sign of declining population, human tampering of nests or even poor driving choices by ORV users.

The National Park Service needs to think clearly about the original intended use of this National Park. It was set aside as a "recreation area" for the citizens of this country AND a nature reserve. There is NO reason that both uses cannot continue to be preserved, enjoyed and supported by all parties concerned. As a long time visitor, it breaks my heart to think that the 'Environmental Lobby' and a few special interest groups can so adversely affect the lives of so many people from all over this country and others by trying to impose regulations that were never needed in the first place. A little bit of tolerance and awareness is all that is required to keep this "treasure" of a place enjoyable for all.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	34	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,16,2010 07:21:04						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The ORV management plan that is proposed will have a devastating impact on the economy of Hatteras Island. Since the construction industry on Hatteras Island has declined starting in late 2005, there has been a significant loss of income for our company, but the beach closures has made a bad situation much worse. In 2008 and 2009, our company, Keys Plumbing, Inc, has show a net loss on our books for the first time in 25 years. I believe that in large part, this is due to the beach closures. There are less people visiting Hatteras Island since the beach access is so limited. We do not have numerous shops, restaurants and entertainment facilities, like the northern beaches. The open beaches here, are what attracts visitors. Tourism construction and fishing are our only industries. Without them we cannot survive. Please keep in mind that the people who come here, love the environment, and are good stewards of this resource. People who enjoy what this area has to offer, would not want any harm to come to wildlife or birds. The closures have not increased the bird population and nests any more than when the beaches were open. Please take the people who live and work on Hatteras Island into consideration when putting any ORV plan into place.</p> <p>Thank You, Janice Keys</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	35	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,16,2010 18:15:26						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>My wife and children and I have been visiting the Outer Banks since 1978. Mostly we visit Avon and Buston, NC. We have always noticed the respectfulness for which everyone shows for the beaches in the Cape Hatteras Seashore. I strongly oppose closing those beaches. We do not feel that there has been enough factual information that justifies the closure of these beaches. There also has to be some balance here, between the public's use of the seashore for recreation and personal enjoyment and for nature loving enthusiasts who feel that their use supersedes anyone else's.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	36	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,16,2010 18:26:10						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>You have some good folks that walk/drive to fish, shell, birdwatch, recreate, swim, etc. They have been promised access and do deserve to have access to the beaches and points. They have Pea Island off limits to drivers for the birds, turtles. They also have Bear Island, Portsmouth Island, Core Banks areas, Cape Lookout areas. The problem birds don't successfully reproduce in the areas that the fuss is all about, namely, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area that was taken years ago with the promise of it being for the people to enjoy.</p> <p>Seems simple. Pray you will do right by the original intent for this area and allow humans a place to get away and enjoy.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	37	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,16,2010 20:50:50						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The negotiated rulemaking and management plan has created one of the worst situations I have seen or experienced in my life. I'm disappointed with government and anyone trying to pretend to protect the wildlife of Hatteras Island. These organizations have come in with money and lawyers and the small government of NC ran the other way. Island folks have paid the price during this bad economic time. They need to be paid damages, but by who! I knew that the common citizens of this island should have sued first to stop them but it was too late. It happened so quickly. nobody new what was happening.</p> <p>I also know that after two years of this mess it will finally be corrected because those same people fought for justice and uncovered/exposed many unjust and potential criminal activities on the part of DOW and Audobon. Not to mention, no scientific protocol to support any of their claims. One of their leaders does not even pay his Dare County property taxes, year over year. This is type of person is looking out for the wildlife or trying to better the world through DOW/Audobon? Put him in jail!</p> <p>Everybody knows why these groups came here to NC. MONEY! They wanted a big issue that would open the purses of old ladies and the wallets of their midwest and western friends. Now that they have lost, they will move down to S.C. or Topsail Island and start a new campaign.</p> <p>There are very few politicians or government representative that I trust. They all seem to have a personal issue that causes them to screw their loved ones or the people they were hired by to represent. Do me a favor and unscrew this mess that was created by some judge or some politician or some greedy DOW/Audobon lawyer. Just unscrew it so I can go fishing!</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	38	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Plunkett, Dawn						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,17,2010 04:17:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>please dont close the beaches... as a hatteras island home owner and fisherman I pray we can find a way to keep our rights to drive on the beaches. I purchased this lot so i could enjoy this freedom and dont understand why we should lose this right. if we are protecting specific areas during specific seasonal breeding i might understand but this is loss will take away the right to access this land should be a right of the people to enjoy the beauty this land has to offer.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	39	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Heiser, Richard W						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,18,2010 06:36:53						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am 57 years of age and a North Carolina native. My uncle choreographed the "Lost Colony" in the late 1940's and early 1950's. I have been going to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (CHNSRA) since I was two years of age. I have been a member of the North Carolina Beach Buggy Association since 1977. I am a responsible environmental fisherman</p> <p>Upon reading the DEIS for the CHNSRA I see it totally ignores the history, cultural importance and traditional use of the CHNSRA in favor of a narrow focused agenda.</p> <p>The 800 plus pages of the DEIS ignores the people who live and work within the boundaries of the CHNSRA. These folks live in public communities surrounded by the CHNSRA. Further, the DEIS ignores the citizens of the United States of America with regards to their access to the beaches of the CHNSRA.</p> <p>The established boundaries of the CHNSRA preclude further commercial development so these town within the park cannot expand and I agree with that.</p> <p>I am in agreement with an ORV plan for the CHNSRA, I do not see within the pages of the DEIS an ORV plan that makes any rational sense. I see plans designed to prohibit or eliminate access to traditional areas where recreational activities such as sunbathing, surf fishing, swimming, and picnicking take place. Many ORV plans have been proposed that made sense, many ORV plans are already in place in other areas that make sense with some modification for the specific geographic location of the CHNSRA. The problem here is, these real alternatives have been ignored in favor of</p>						

excessively restrictive plans.

The DEIS is misleading, it does not represent the whole story, just like the consent order that was put in place a couple years ago. These actions are strangling North Carolina and it's people, not to mention eliminating our pursuit of happiness when it comes to our CHNSRA.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	40	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,19,2010 10:21:53						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The Hatteras Seashore is a beautiful area and a great place to visit. I have been there 3 to 4 times over the last 10 years. My brother and friends have been going each year for the last 15 to 20 years.</p> <p>Eliminating beach access will most likely stop me from coming down.</p> <p>I love to fish and the seashore is a great place to go. Everytime we go everyone in our party is responsible and does not do anything to destroy the environment. All the fishermen respect the ocean and the seashore.</p> <p>I agree that control is required but eliminating access will also eliminate the ability for thousands to enjoy the seashore.</p> <p>To protect the seashore for all to enjoy, setting limits so all can thrive and enjoy is a great idea. Permitting ORV is a great idea to help pay for times when protection and repair are required.</p> <p>The seashore is here for all to enjoy, eliminate beach ORV will take that ability away for so many.</p> <p>Thanks, Tom</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	41	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,20,2010 07:18:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please provide for maximum access to our beaches. People who use the beaches are nearly all good stewards of the land. The lawsuits and the "science" behind them are frivolous and just don't use good common sense or scientific facts in an attempt to ruin an economy and deny simple recreation to all types of outdoorsmen and women.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	42	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Sims, Brian S						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,20,2010 09:49:40						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please leave the current rules regarding beach access as they are today. No changes are necessary from the status quo. Please allow those of us who use the beach responsibly to continue to enjoy the beauty and splendor of this public and natural resource. Thank you!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	43	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,22,2010 09:41:36						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am 50 years old and have used the beaches of the Outerbanks since I was a child. As time has passed the use of ORV on the beaches has become more and more restrictive. The past few years have escalated to the point that the use of the beaches has become so restrictive that it is terrible. There are so many closures to beach access that for ORV that the few areas of access are extremely congested. It has become so bad that I have considered trying to find another place to vacation on weekends and my two weeks of vacation during the summer. I have searched up and down the east coast to try and find another place for beach access during the mid summer months. I did not find anything on the entire east coast. The Outerbanks is the only place that I can find that I can continue my lifelong tradition of taking my family for a ride on the beach and finding an uncongested area to swim and fish. The current efforts through legislation have become too restrictive to those who like to use their ORV to enjoy the beach. I just don't understand why my family and many others that have used this area for several generations have fewer rights than a few animals. This is the only place on the east coast for me to use the beach with my ORV. The animals have the rest of the entire east coast to use. If there is a problem for these animals in the Outerbanks they will move a little farther north or south. I do not have that option. At what point do the citizens have any rights? I should have some say so! The current proposal of beach access is too restrictive on ORV. I would encourage the NPS to give a greater consideration to the use of ORVs. My family has been using the beaches for generations and believes the NPS has encroached on our rights.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	44	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Pereira, Charles M						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,22,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Birds and man can co-exist together, especially sea birds that have walked among surf fishermen for over 100 years on Hatteras Island.</p> <p>The presence of surf fishermen, at least those on foot, at Cape Point, Cape Hatteras, and other spits that have long been the mecca of surf fishing in the Outer Banks, will not cause any measurable harm to any bird population. The banning of fishermen, especially those on foot, will however kill most of the businesses and livelihoods of the humans who have called the Outer Banks home for over 100 years.</p> <p>The use of legal action predicated on non-adherence to a 1970's Presidential Executive Order regarding ORV use is a smart way for several extremist groups to get their way without submitting to negotiated rulemaking or other forms of compromise. It is not a smart way to foster cooperation or further the ideals that our country has made great for over 230 years.</p> <p>The overwhelming majority of fishermen love birds and would never do anything to hurt one, even if it meant changing his or her fishing habits. Closures such as those required by the consent decree and the current lack of compromise are a good way to change this sporting love and turn it into anger, contempt, and bad blood.</p> <p>I request that NPS establish a final rule that allows at least foot access for all people, fishermen included, in all parts of Cape Hatteras National Park at all times of the year. Protective enclosures consistent with pre-Consent Decree practices and appropriate signage should be used, along with education and enforcement, to protect species.</p> <p>No final rule should preclude human presence on any shoreline - there should always be at least a 30 foot area from the water's edge where humans are allowed to be walking, fishing, or otherwise peacefully enjoying themselves.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	45	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,23,2010 05:48:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	While I believe the Park Service is doing the best they can with what they have to work with, I believe also that we are bowing to an affront to the very reason our national parks were formed. There is a difference between "park" and "refuge". I feel that the special interest groups want to turn our beaches into refuges, thus denying us the right to recreational use of them. Much of the land that is considered Cape Hatteras National Seashore was LENDED						

to the federal government for the originally agreed upon purposes. At one time a great deal of this property was privately owned. I feel that if the government is going to renege on its promise to make this a recreational area, these lands should be returned to the original owners, and the Park system dismantled if small, private groups can override the wishes of the general populace. Needless to say, a bird's nest doesn't need as much area as is proposed. Birds fledge, and fly. One hundred yards around a nest should be more than adequate. Please get some input from scientists not connected to the environmental groups involved. Pre - nesting areas are a joke. A bird isn't going to fly over, see the areas staked out, and nest there. Don't take a genius to know that these birds nest where they do because they already think it is safe enough. Please use common sense when making these decisions. A lot of really smart people are that way in certain specialized areas while being totally clueless in others. Please give the "PEOPLE" a voice in this, the general population, and not the loudest screamers. Thank You. Johnnie Baum / The Hatteras Island Poet

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	46	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,23,2010 06:27:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Previous to the current situation, large portions of Hatteras Island's beaches were already closed to ORV use. This includes Pea Island, Buxton, and Hatteras Village year around. In addition Rodanthe and Avon village beaches were closed seasonally. Also in addition, soft barriers prohibited driving on large portions of the beach at Cape Pt. and Hatteras Inlet. The overwhelming majority of ORV owners respected these limitations without question. There was virtually no evidence of significant environmental damage. Yet, the Federal Court has imposed regulations which prohibit ORV use on large portions of the most popular areas on the island. This has been based on flawed procedures and questionable science. Any plan should allow people to have a few feet above the high tide line to drive and park on most if not all of the island. I am opposed to the DEIS as written and would respectfully request that ORV use be expanded not contracted. Thanks. Joe Basilone 39191 Sunfish Ct. Avon, NC						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	47	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,23,2010 07:46:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The issue of ORV access the point at Cape Hatteras is an important one for fishermen and the local economy of the Outer Banks community. As anyone who has tried to walk to the point can attest it really is not possible if one is carrying even minimal gear for fishing. Thus, use of 4-wheeled drive vehicles is essential if "useful" access is to be maintained. There are no alternatives - ie a shuttle system where fishermen could be taken out & brought back during periods of peak usage. This option is never mentioned - perhaps it should be - other national parks have concession where folks are given bus tours through the park to help eliminate congestion by autos - why not on the beach - could use quiet electric vehicles - provide a few more jobs in the community - and help reduce impact of excessive ORV traffic. Of the various options in the document it seems that option F provides the most access. The question of closures due to wildlife should be scrutinized for its validity. "Accidental" movement of a species into an area where there is no historical evidence to show this area was a preferred area for nesting/breeding should not be considered grounds for closures.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	48	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,23,2010 08:15:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My family has been going down to the outer banks since 1982, when we bought a time share in Nags Head. We enjoyed our time there in the winter so much that we ended up buying membership at Pea Island Resort, now know as Camp Hatteras, just so we could come down whenever we wanted. The fishing and beach driving was one of the biggest draws for us as I'm sure it is for the majority of the tourist the outer banks gets. Until an incident happened on the beach a few years ago, there was never any problem with the ORV drivers. They respected the wild life, didn't drive up on the dunes etc. There was no need to close off large sections of the beach to protect wild life, just areas roped off which was respected by ORV's. Then all of the sudden the invirementlists jumped on the band wagon when that incident took place. After that it was one excuse after another to close off sections of the beach areas, especially the spots where the best fishing was. I guess that just happens to be the area some bird chose to nest. I have noticed a lot less people coming to OBX for the fishing and beach driving because of the restrictions that were implemented. First it was getting a fishing license, which for my wife and I, is \$60 a year since we are nonresidents, nor can we get a lifetime license even though we are in our late 60's. Here in VA, people our age are no longer required to have a salt water license. Then it was closing sections of the beach for ORV at the best fishing spots, not that there is any fish to be caught. As that isn't bad enough, there is even talk of a fee to drive on public property! I seriously doubt those responsible for making up these rules, getting well paid and more than likely do not live on the outer banks, nor take into consideration the loss of revenue from gas sales, food sales, rentals etc. I say go back to the old way and if someone violates the protected areas, then ban them from driving on the beach.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	49	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,23,2010 17:32:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been vacationing in Cape Hatteras for over 5 years now. I don't mind giving up access in order to protect the wildlife. I prefer Alternative D. I wish to see the maximum consideration given to protecting wildlife and resources from off-road vehicles.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	50	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,24,2010 08:45:40						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	ORVs can peacefully co-exist with all animal species. There has never been a documented case where an ORV or ORV traffic has killed a bird on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. In Corpus Christi, Texas, regular 2WD vehicles travel the beach freely and there is an abundant plover and many other bird population. We can peacefully co-exist with all animal and plant life. The second point is that you are killing the tourism industry and fishing industry for this once thriving island. Please allow ORVs to travel the seashore in peaceful co-existence with the environment. We can make this a win-win for humans and the environment.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	51	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	riggs, richard m						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,24,2010 10:05:55						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Our family has been visiting Cape Hatteras since the '60's. Every visit left us impressed with the area and the locals that clearly respect their home and the natural environs where they live . We have purchased 2 homes on the outer banks, one in kill devil hills, the 2nd in Buxton. As such, we believe we have a stake in the future of the outer banks, and offer the following comment: Please adopt a philosophy closely shadowing that of our medical professions: Please do no harm! Do not harm the businesses, do not harm the fishermen, do not harm tourist access. Unless and until a legitimate "Dr. Doolittle" emerges, all the science in the world falls short of speaking for the						

plover, turtles, etc.

the only species i believe can be fairly spoken for are those being hunted by the NPS rangers as they choose which animals are "good" and which are "bad".

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	52	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,25,2010 06:28:16						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please provide year round unrestricted daytime/nighttime ORV access from the low tide line to 100 feet above the high tide line. During turtle nesting dates, do not allow driving parrallel to the beach within 200 feet (or 50 feet beyond the average turtle crawl/nesting distance )allow vehicles to approach the water at a 90 degree angle and park at that designated distance from the water. Additionally, I do not mind paying for this right of access. Every visitor should apply/pay for a park ORV pass \$ 5.00 per day, 10.00 per week, 50.00 per year. This will provide a means to educate the users and make them more aware of the wildlife and fines/penalties for breaking use restrictions.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	53	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,26,2010 01:27:27						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Comments on Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Negotiated Rulemaking and Management Plan/EIS 2010 03Mar 05 for North Carolina National Seashore</p> <p>Looking at the data provided in Chapter 3: Affected Environment of the proposed plan it would seem that the Piping Plover, Loggerhead turtle, and Leatherback turtle populations have remained relatively consistent from 1995 to 2009 with the exception of a dramatic drop from 2002 ? 2004. With the populations of these animals again within acceptable limits, I would venture to assume that human disturbance of their habitat(s) is of questionable impact.</p> <p>I have personally visited several of the beach areas under consideration, most particularly from the Oregon Inlet Campground north to Nags Head and from the northern tip of Ocracoke Island south to the ferry terminal and have seen little activity on the beach areas except for fishermen with few ORV's and foot traffic in the highest-density tourist areas directly adjacent to motels/hotels. Foot traffic around private and rental beach-side houses appeared to be minimal or non-existent.</p> <p>As for the American oystercatcher, Chapter 3 also cites human traffic as the least responsible form of disturbance affecting survival rates (4% - tied with avian predation) according to Simons and Shulte 2008 (on pg. 232.) Since it would appear that mammalian predation (58%), and I am assuming this to be due to foxes or other naturally-occurring and federally-protected species that do not include humans, is by far the greatest threat to chick survival that there be further study into the populations of these animals and their impact on ecology before any further action or planning to limit human traffic be considered. As for increased populations of raccoons in areas frequented by humans, I see this as a real and present danger due to droppings of foodstuffs, accidental or otherwise. Maybe the study should include a look at the number of these animals and consider limiting it to a level appropriate to the habitat(s) in question.</p> <p>There seems to be great emphasis placed on the study of high-disturbance areas and the resultant impact on breeding populations of all the animals listed, however the same study reports that human traffic is only responsible for a small portion of the populations' threats. Also, it appears to me that only a relatively small portion of the Outer Banks coastline is accessible to humans and their presence is a minor factor in the overall survival rate of any of the threatened species. It is noble for humans to consider the resultant effect they have when traveling any part of the earth, but it is impossible to do so with absolutely zero impact, not to mention that we, as fellow inhabitants of the earth, have just as much right to be in any given area as any other species.</p> <p>There already exists well-delineated areas for foot traffic as well as ORV's and, as long as these boundaries are observed, no further action should be necessary. I, therefore, see no need to further limit accessibility to the beach by humans.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kevin Dawkins.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	54	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,26,2010 17:43:27						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	First, thank you for providing this forum. In my forty years or so of enjoying the Outer Banks, I cannot recall a single instance of irresponsible behavior, by ORVs or pedestrians, much less any behavior which threatened the plantlife or wildlife. The Interim Strategy was well designed and did a good job of maintaining a fair balance between plants, wildlife, and humans. While I can't claim to have read the 800+ pages of the DEIS, the data I came across seemed to support that conclusion. After doing some research on the history of the Consent Decree, and listening to people like Dr. Berry of UNC, an honest-to-God environmentalist, teacher and an individual who understands the data and procedures involved in government processes like this, it becomes quite clear that the process was hijacked for political use and that the American people have been ignored until now. Since there was no valid reason to enact the Consent Decree and the Interim Strategy was doing an adequate job, it's time to return to a reasonable set of rules for use of this amazing mostly NATURAL resource, so that local businesses can continue to provide for tourists and we can all go back to enjoying this wonderful place. We don't need a Virginia Beach "south". Respectfully, Brian Palazzolo						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	55	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,29,2010 05:10:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose the denial of vehicular and pedestrian access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I live and work here and part of the reason for living here is the beauty and availability of some of the best beaches anywhere. I also fish and having vehicular access is critical. I feel that a well managed and enforced open beach policy is critical to the people and the economy of this area. The tourism industry is our backbone and the consent decree has crippled us. In my opinion, the use of the beaches and water of Hatteras, Ocracoke, and Nags Head has actually given the birds and wildlife more than we have taken in that the spoil islands that have been made over the years provide untouched habitat. Therefore we have given more that we have taken, in my opinion.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	56	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Test, Convio						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,29,2010 10:53:17						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is a test. Please disregard this message.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	57	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	BlackwellUS, Bill						
<b>Received:</b>	Mar,29,2010 13:33:06						

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I have enjoyed using the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore since 1972, and I currently own property in Salvo. I firmly believe that the actions of the National Park Service in conjunction with the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC), Audubon Society, and Defenders of Wildlife in creating the Consent Decree of 2008 are despicable. How can three environmental groups and a single federal judge dictate land use and policy on a recreational area created by congress for the enjoyment of the American people? Furthermore, I blame Mike Murray and his superiors for allowing the environmental groups who brought the lawsuit to retain their seats on the Negotiated Rules Committee. Due to this decision, several hundred thousand dollars of taxpayers money and hundreds of hours of time were wasted by the dedicated participants.

I have scanned the DEIS and would never attempt to argue with 800 pages (much of it redundant) of governmental data. There is one part of the DEIS which makes no sense. If the Cape Hatteras National Seashore was created mainly for recreation, why are the most popular visitor areas (Oregon Inlet, Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet and Ocracoke Inlet) closed or highly restricted to vehicles and pedestrians during the peak of the tourist season (March to August)? It continues to baffle my mind how the Park Service can ruin the enjoyment of thousand of seashore visitors and hurt the local economy because of a few shorebirds.

Another policy that I strongly oppose is predator control for the plovers. My interpretation of the Organic Act is that predator control in national parks is permissible to rid the park of animals which are detrimental to the park's purpose. Since the seashore was created as a recreational area and is not a bird refuge, how can the park service justify killing fox, otter, mink, racoon and other native mammals to protect piping plovers? Personally, I prefer otters to plovers, so what gives the federal government the right to affect the balance of nature and choose which species lives or dies? Furthermore, since these animals do not pose any danger to humans, there is no justification for killing them.

In conclusion, prior to the Consent Decree the park service was doing an adequate job under the Interim Strategy. An ORV plan was being developed by the federal government with input from users and locals. The environmental groups have ruined the entire process by attempting to limit access and recreational use of the seashore. The ironic part is that most of the environmental supporters will never set foot on the outer banks because most of their finances and backers are from out of state. Unfortunately, it is becoming obvious that these organizations have connections and employees in the Department of Interior and other federal agencies. In my opinion, this influence is the main reason that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is losing its status as an outstanding recreational area for families to visit. If Alternative F is selected the seashore will lose much of its popularity and reputation as a vacation destination.

**Correspondence ID:** 58    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Schwartz, Rodger w

**Received:** Mar,29,2010 16:22:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Concerned,

Since coming to the Outer Banks in 1977 as a member of the U S Coast Guard I have seen the Outer Banks go through alot of changes. I have watched the people of the Outer Banks grow a vigorous economy rich with the histroy of not only it's local people but of Global Fame. From the Wright Brothers whose accomplishments have changed our world to the humble Outer Banks fisherman it has been a place to come and bring children to show them about life that they will cherish forever. But with the closure of the beaches the once vibrant history of the Outer Banks is dying. I am watching as the lifetimes of the old and the hopes of the young are being dashed aside. For the past 100 years people have been free to enjoy the beaches fully. And in that past 100 years there has never been a need for the closure of the beaches. All Life has shared it with no ill effects. The changes I now see as a resident is truly life changing and disheartning. The old fishermen no longer can drive out to the beach to teach the young the fine art of fishing - which is mostly about patience. Hours spent just admiring the beautiful ocean , it's ebb and flow. Same as life. Retired folks who have waited all their lives to spend their last days fishing the same now find that future dashed. Geologists will tell you that the Outer Banks in it's present form has only been around for the last 3500 years. They will also tell you that in another 100 years or so it may be gone all together due to rising sea level. I will ask what sense does it make to close a beach that has limited time just to protect wildlife that has thrived all along with no help from us anyway. Recently I purchased property in West Virginia. The site is on the top of a mountain and is an abandoned airfield. Much to my surprise the first birds I heard on top of that mountain just happened to be sandpipers. They were living in shallow ponds that formed when it rained. But these ponds do not last long and yet here they were, shorebirds making a life almost 400 miles away from the shore. I wish to state that I am for total open beaches year round. I am for the economy of the Outer Banks to remain a place where my children can come and bring their children in the future to a place we hold so dear. The Outer Banks as we know it depends on the beaches to bring the tourists to our shores to enjoy the beach. It was supposed to be a National Recreation Park for the citizens of our Country. It was set aside for this reason. Should the beaches be closed the area will surely die. The property values will plummet. People will no longer flock to this summer vacation site as there will be no reason for them to come. Towns will struggle and eventually find themselves failing if not bankrupt. This is not the future that should be allowed to come to be. The Outer Banks has too great a history, from the lifesaving stations along it's beaches to the wright brothers, to die this death. I wonder where the Wright brothers would have gone had they not had the ability to come to the outer banks? Please keep the beaches open fully. Educate the public about the birds and wildlife that has caused this concern but above all keep the beaches open. Thank you for allowing us to comment. Rodger Schwartz

**Correspondence ID:** 59    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,01,2010 08:37:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow 4WD vehicles to continue to enjoy the beauty of this national treasure. 4WD vehicles can safely coexist with nature and there has never been a single documented event of an RV harming an endangered species. Please allow us to continue to enjoy the beauty of Cape Hatteras.

**Correspondence ID:** 60    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** martof, andrew b

**Received:** Apr,01,2010 10:56:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray I am pleased the park service is formulating a sustainable operational plan for beach access for North Carolina's Outer Banks. I feel that the Consent Decree was extremely one-sided, non-scientific, heavy handed, and punitive to all non-offending human park visitors. I expect a more reasonable compromise in the final plan.

The areas closed for nesting under the Consent Decree are not the ONLY areas suitable for bird/turtle nesting. In fact, the Pea Island refuge and much of the Outer Banks from Okracoke down to Diamond Shoals is uninhabited and open for all nesting. Any of these areas can be seasonally restricted to allow nesting, study of wildlife behavior, and outcome measurement. The CAPE POINT and INLETS, however, are extremely unique and as such, are points of prime interest to the human visitors to the park. The complete closure of these areas is as absurd as totally closing OLD FAITHFUL or the north rim of the GRAND CANYON to the visiting public so that a possible nesting opportunity may not be lost.

I would very strongly support a compromise policy that allows year-around human visitation to the CAPE POINT and INLETS with restrictions for wildlife nesting in other areas of the park. These areas should be managed based on the very best science available. I realize your task is difficult, but please consider my thoughts as the new policy is negotiated. thank you Andy Martof DDS

**Correspondence ID:** 61    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** Apr,01,2010 14:26:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You cannot be series. Do not close the beach access. Hatteras is a staple in the surfing community and just because politicians suck at life doesn't mean

they should make everyone else miserable. KEEP IT OPEN

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	62	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,01,2010 14:32:44						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Build a road going parrallel a 1/4 mile out if your wanting vehicles to not hit the turtle nest. You can't just take away the beach! In Hawaii nobody owns the beach! Have people take mandatory classes on the reasons why you want to take the beach away as a part of self awareness and protecting the land.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	63	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Floyd, Jonathan A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,01,2010 14:38:16						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to voice my opinion as both a surfer and a conservationist. I would hope that regulations can exist that offer forms of seasonal closure that directly correlate with ecological implications, such as migratory nesting, and not a blanket ban on ORV use for the National Seashore. Thank you, Adam Floyd						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	64	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,01,2010 15:03:13						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	allow people access to beach during all daylight hours,restrict vehicle traffic in areas of enviornmental concern						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	65	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	barley, brett						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,01,2010 15:04:50						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thousands of Human Lives -- VS. -- a Couple Birds Lives ..... what's the most LOGICAL answer according to importance??						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	66	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,01,2010 15:35:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been traveling to the beaches of the outer banks be4 some of these protesting organizations knew what they were. Countless surf trip miles were logged on multiple vehicles purchased throughout my ever aging life just to camp out and catch some good surf at Cape Hatteras. To many east coasters, especially surfers, closing Hatteras would be a devastating move. Tourism, is a way of life for the locals at the banks. It could potentially be devastating economically to them, as many tourists come to the OBX to enjoy the Cape Hatteras area. Please keep both surfers and the locals who have been using this area RESPECTIVELY for many years close to your minds when making such drastic decisions.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	67	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Cronin, James J						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,01,2010 16:42:51						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This will be a destructive effort to the community of the Outer Banks as well as the surfers and fishermen who wish to use the beaches year-round. Removing access from certain areas should not be the choice of outsiders agencies who advocate for things that do not affect them. The choice should be within the community and that of the people whom of which will be directly affected by your plans to disrupt their lives. It is with great urgency that I say you must not continue with the solutions you have proposed.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	68	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,01,2010 16:43:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	No need to shut off the beach. Maybe at night at certain times of the year. But not like what is being proposed. Shutting off this will hurt businesses as well who really need the patronage.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	69	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,01,2010 16:46:40						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a surfer and avid environmentalist, the issue of closing the outer banks and other parts of the East Coast presents a conflict. What is more important, free access to the beach or protecting our natural coastline? As a former local resident and surfer in San Diego, California for almost 10 years, I know there is a solution to both. It used to be in San Diego after major holidays (especially 4th of July), there would be trash lining the beach for miles and pollution to the water was horrendous. In response to this increased pollution, city government made a very good decision. They decided to outlaw smoking and alcohol on public beaches. While this sure made partying on the beach less fun, it decreased pollution problems exponentially. I volunteered for beach clean ups before and after this law was made, and I can say from personal experience there was a huge difference. Before the law, I would personally collect 3 trash bags full of trash from a small stretch of beach after the 4th of July. After the law was passed, I had trouble filling one trash bag up after covering a few miles of beach, on July 5th, on the same beach. Protecting the environment, especially such delicate ecosystems frequently visited by humans, like the coastlines, should be a top priority. But blocking all access from the public will simply create more problems as surfers and fishermen will continue to try to get to the beaches. Instead, it is cheaper and more effective to simply ban certain substances that create large amounts of pollution. I would encourage you to work with frequent visitors to the beach, local government, and other local environment groups to find out what is the primary cause of pollution along your coastline. While people will always pose a threat to the environment regarding pollution, this threat can be greatly reduced by simple and straightforward legislation. Again, I love and wish to protect the environment like many others, but blocking access is not the answer. Thank you for your time in reading and listening to my argument, I sincerely hope you take it to heart. Very Respectfully, William Baker						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	70	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		

**Name:** Perez, Adam  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 17:10:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Restricting on beach driving to beaches during certain seasons, (with nothing to do with tourism) KNOWN to be homes to ENDANGERED species is a good idea. But restricting surfing ANYWHERE is ridiculous. Surfers are one of the most pro-nature groups around. PROTECT what we have, NOT ban it.

**Correspondence ID:** 71 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** allison, chuck  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 17:30:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been a property owner on hatteras island for over 40 years. My family and I spend three weeks a year in our cottage, using the beach for recreation(reading, Surfing, sunning, fishing). We have five teachers in the family, so we have an idea of the issues facing the island. Looking at the Document it would seem that the best choice would be C however in the real world F will probably be best accepted overall. The efforts of the Audubon Society /Southern enviro. legal group / Defenders of Wildlife seem to be aimed at taking the Recreation out of the hands of the Park Service and also removing public usage for the island, Please do not let this happen,

**Correspondence ID:** 72 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Shooter, Matt  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 17:31:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recently just moved from Wilmington, NC to California. I remember being able to ride out on the beach with my family in the Outer Banks. It is so much fun. Also I surf all the time. The last thing anyone would think of doing out there is hurting the environment or trashing the place. The beautiful tranquil area is enough to make you want to enjoy it rather than not. I have been there numerous times just for vacation and surf trips. I think that at least 95% of true surfers are more responsible for positive things towards the ocean and its surroundings more than tourists. Surfing is a way of life and I know on the East Coast that the Outer Banks is an "epicenter" for surflife. I always pick up trash off the beach when I surf because I feel like it is the right thing to do and especially for karma when you are in the water. I don't know how this issue got started about this but I think that shutting down almost all of the beach is just not righth considering that we are all Americans and should be able to enjoy this atmosphere and beautiful place.

**Correspondence ID:** 73 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 18:28:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE THINK ABOUT SURFERS WHO USE IHE BEACH TOO, ON YOUR VOTING ABOUT THE OUTER BANKS!

**Correspondence ID:** 74 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Langston, Bob E  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 18:35:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The idea of possibly closing certain beaches in the outer banks to surfers is ludicrous. I have surfed in Hatteras for 28 years, and it is the most sacred spot to east coast surfers everywhere. Even Kelley Slater was quoted as saying that Hatteras was "My Pipeline, My Mecca". If legislation starts to move forward on this, there is gonna be one heck of a bees nest of surfers that will fight it.

**Correspondence ID:** 75 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 18:37:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It's reatarded to take away our beaches for birds and turtle eggs. We're already in a depression and yes I know they call it recession but it isn't and anyone who would disagree needs to open their eyes. My grandmother owns Outer Banks Motel which has been open since 1953. She is 81 years old and she has to work 7 days a week since the whole audoban situation has occurred. People do not want to come here and spend money when they dont even know if the beaches are going to be open. My mom and dad own a tackle business and they're on the way to going bankrupt since the point has been closed on and off. PLEASE KEEP OUR BEACHES OPEN OUR ECONOMY IS AT STAKE HERE ON THE OBX.  
 Thanks

**Correspondence ID:** 76 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Thomas, William  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 18:46:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please consider the people who live off the land. People native to this region for 100's of years have had the government step into their lives and tell them where they could live, though they owned the land, changing their pursuit of providing for their families. Please do not let such a travesty happen again - with no proof that the alleged damage is actually done by users of the beaches. Please keep all access prior to the existing ruling open to people, vehicles, surfers, and fisherman. They care the most for it. As a citizen of this state with the wild open beaches a part of my heritage please allow for me to continue to pass along this way of life to my son. Please continue to study the alleged damages in order to present facts and data instead of ideologies changing a balanced way of life for people who live off the land and the water. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 77 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 19:17:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Banning all ORV's is not the answer. Surfers and fishermen are taxpayers also and deserve access to this land. However I do respect the need to preserve nature and the habitat. Perhaps having the rangers roping off areas suitable for driving that would not interfere with the local animals with extremely large penalties for venturing off course would be a solution. Night driving could be allowed seasonally when it does not interfere with turtle nesting. There are many solutions that would allow us to co-habitate instead of just banning the use of these areas.  
 Thank you,

**Correspondence ID:** 78 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 20:05:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have spent a significant amount of time traveling to Cape Hatteras and the Outer Banks over the years and I have always been respectful of the natural scenery during my many visits. The purpose of my trips has primarily been to go surfing and from what I've seen my fellow surfers are always very respectful of the environment as well. I heard there was a plan to restrict access to these beaches and I want to make my plea that surf access be allowed. To take these beaches away from the people is an extreme solution and I hope that something more reasonable can be agreed upon.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 79    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.01.2010 20:16:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i would just like to express my opinion about the OBX being closed to surfers. Coming from a 20 year old pro surfer i would just like to say i was very disappointed to here about the closure of beaches to surfers. i have been in the outer banks so many times and had so many good memories surfing some amazing sandbars and hope that you reconsider the closure our surf beaches

---

**Correspondence ID:** 80    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 20:55:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This stretch of park is a nesting ground for sea turtles, however to limit access to humans would be unjust. More research needs to go into specific site analysis of nesting habitats. Certain zones could be flagged from constant watch, none the less it would give some of the park service rangers more work during these weak economic times. Without further scientific studies the beaches should be placed in limited access to only permitted individuals. These individuals could be checked in and have maps of specific areas of interest that cannot be disrupted. Checkpoints could present a very effective way of monitoring. Being a graduate student of natural sciences and a native carolinian I believe more scientific research should be done before anything gets approved.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 81    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.01.2010 21:04:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been an avid surfer for 30 years.  
Over the years I have seen far too many instances of taking a yard when given an inch by surfers, so whatever decision you make must include oversight and enforcement.  
I don't wish to see access to the waves rescinded, but I do believe that dune and wildlife sensitivity must be taken into account. A balance that protects the environment and allows surfing would be optimal.  
Surfers can walk some distance, and some beach driving may be acceptable in certain areas.  
One thing not mentioned is that any vehicle driving on the beach MUST be ABSOLUTELY OIL-LEAK FREE. It is imperative that cars be routinely inspected for oil leaks.  
Or, perhaps the only vehicles allowed should be electric.  
Go with the science.  
sincerely, Paul Cunningham

---

**Correspondence ID:** 82    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 22:19:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in regards to ORV access along the outer banks during the summer month. I am an Environmental Studies major in college with an Economics minor so I can hopefully work on issues such as this as an Environmental Economist. I am also a surfer. I am going to disagree with 99% of my fellow surfers on this topic. I feel it is IMPERATIVE that Off Road Vehicle access is limited during summer nesting month for the protection of sea turtles and shore bird nesting. Night time driving undoubtedly should be banned. If driving is permitted in the height of the swell season (september-october) surfers should be appeased and that is an issue you should consider and raise in hearings. As long as the birds are done nesting and the sea turtles have hatched and made it to the ocean, by September with the hurricane swells, there should be minimal conflict. I am going to talk with my room mate who worked for Audobon with shore bird nesting in NC and down on Bald Head with Sea Turtle nesting to get some concrete data on the time frame these animals need the protection. The majority of the tropical swells that hit the outer banks an the winter storms that bring surf do not interfere with shore bird nesting summers are flat when there is no reason to go drive the beach to hunt for waves. Additionally vehicle access in the winter months creates suitable nesting grounds for certain seabirds as it clears out vegetation which they don't like nesting near. in short here are points for you to bring up at the public hearings to protect the fauna of the outer banks.  
1) nesting seasons and surf seasons are not aligned. 2) since the season don't align it is not going to impact the enjoyment of the surfers and the protection of endangered species.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 83    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.01.2010 23:25:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:  
Human access is a necessary right that needs to be preserved in this process. I spent a few summers of my childhood in the Outer Banks, and if Hatteras was closed to human access, we would have vacationed closer to home. Do not think only of the residents of the area, but of the tourist dollars that pour in to local businesses during the summers. This area is an important ecological area, but by educating visitors to the area, many of the potential problems can be avoided. Better signage and awareness campaigns can be productive in managing the already very low risk of negative human/animal interactions. Humans and animals have coexisted in the area for years, and can continue to do so. I hope to be able to visit the area in the future, as I am an avid surfer, and Hatteras is an important destination for many surf travelers.  
Thank you for your time,  
Chris Lupin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 84    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,01,2010 23:51:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live at perhaps the most disputed recent Nature vs. Humanity battle - The Trestles vs. the 241 Toll Road Expansion. I live directly at the current end of the Toll Road, and I Surf at Trestles At least once a week, so the transportation would have benefited me quite a bit. However, I stand 100% against any

expansion of Human Waste, Construction, and Recklessness and supported stopping the Toll Road. Thanks to the support of many from all around, The Toll Road was stopped, hopefully for good. The most important part of this process is that respectful surfers and a few beach-goers willing to make the long trek were able to keep their little secluded paradise. What is the point of saving something if no one can appreciate and respect its beauty. I hope that both environment and the world of surfers can reach an agreement on this issue. Thank you for reading my opinion, I hope it is heard.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	85	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 00:02:24						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I support your actions to restrict ORV's on the seashore. I have worked with threatened and endangered species (western snowy plovers and California least terns) for 17 years on California beaches. I know very well the sensitive nature of beach dwelling wildlife. I have observed that the general public tends to propagate a self imposed ignorance to the real issues simply because they want unrestricted beach recreation. Which leaves it up to you to do what is right for the resources. Driving on the beach on the sites I work on is strictly regulated. If it weren't, the plovers and terns would have heavy negative impacts. I can't imagine it being different on your beaches.</p> <p>I encourage you to protect the fragile resources involved.</p> <p>Tom Applegate</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	86	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 01:48:40						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a North Carolina native, I must urge all parties to come to an equitable decision that will both preserve as much beach access as possible while simultaneously working to preserve natural habitat.</p> <p>Please keep in mind surfing not only is a healthy part of life on the Outer Banks, it brings in a substantial amount of revenue for the area. Additionally, I suggest maintaining extensive research to see how the restriction of traffic in closed and protected areas of the beach front effects wildlife populations and erosion. I am particularly opposed to limiting the amount of foot traffic, but support a partial if not full ban on vehicles on nearly all parts of the beach front on the Outer Banks.</p> <p>Best,</p> <p>Larry Queen</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	87	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Anthony, Jeffrey K						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 04:41:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>It is essential to keep the Outer Banks and Cape Hatteras National Seashore as open to the public as possible. Whether visitors or locals the beaches, oceans, marshlands, bays and their included wildlife on the Outer Banks and Cape Hatteras National Seashore are one of our countries treasures and should be shared with all who wish to experience them. As a 10 year employee of the National Park Service at Jacob Riis Park, NY I understand that there is a need to protect the wildlife, but there are alternatives to closing areas. Education is first and most important. If someone would like to drive on the beach there should be a short (15-30min) instructional course to explain the hazards. I have been visiting the Outer Banks for the last 15 years, mostly to compete in ESA's Eastern Surfing Championships, and I would like to continue to visit with the freedom to safely drive the beaches. It is an amazing experience to spend a day on the beach with family and friends surfing the waters and enjoying the sun with the sand in your toes. It should be an experience that is allowed to all who want make the trek down to Cape Hatteras, NC. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Jeff Anthony</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	88	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	BANEZ, MICHAEL R						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 05:24:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>please consider our concerns and keep the Outer Banks open, year round, for the public to enjoy some of nature's most beautiful shores. I represent a group of responsible, surfers, fishermen, and family's who have enjoyed (treasured) North Carolina's Outer Banks. We respect nature, and are responsible stewards of our Natural resources.</p> <p>Don't close one of the finest beaches in the USA, because of the poor treatment, by few irresponsible people, that damage this wonderful shoreline. Instead, let's work together to enact stronger enforcement regulations, so we can punish the one's who are responsible for the damage, and act as responsible stewards of this area, so it can continue to be enjoyed/taken care of, by family's and friends, of the NC coastal environment for years to come. Please, keep the Outer Banks open. Vote for tighter regulations, and enforcement laws, instead of the knee jerk action, of closing the beaches.</p> <p>Michael R. Banez US Army Veteran &amp; Father to a family who enjoys the beauty, surf, and fishing, of the East Coast's finest beaches</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	89	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	F, Jack						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 05:36:26						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As I surfer I can appreciate the need for balance and this holds true to the beach access issue. Reliable access to beaches for surfing is very important and I feel that Option C is the best way to move forward. I am not only voicing my opinion by adding comment but I will be voicing my opinion with dollars. My family and friends make several surf trips per year to the OBX and if beach access becomes restricted we will consider going elsewhere (and there are many more like us). We have a healthy respect for the beach and local wildlife. After all, surfers know what it is like to not be at the top of the food chain.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	90	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Honaker, Ian						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 06:04:15						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I just wanted to say that, in the past, I have taken my family driving on the beach and have enjoyed the liberty of doing so. This has been a tremendous draw to bring my family to the Outer Banks as it is one of the few areas on the East Coast where we can enjoy this kind of activity. It is very adventurous to everyone and great to be able to find a section of the beach that is private. I have read the articles about the bird/wildlife concerns posted by the Audubon society. I am not convinced that beach driving is such a threat to these creatures. I do believe that reckless driving on the beach should have stiff penalties to ensure that everyone is respectful to the environment. I think that a ban on beach driving would economically hurt the locals of the Outer Banks. Of the suggested measures, Alternative C would make the most sense to me. I also think that areas that may be closed to driving at certain</p>						

0008792

times of the year, such as the hook at Diamond Shoals, should be open to pedestrians. I think that restrictions to people (pedestrians) in these areas of the National Park would be dismissing of the idea for creating them..."for the benefit and inspiration of all the people of the United States...." (General Authorities Act), 1970 (84 Stat. 825) That is my opinion. Thank you for your time.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	91	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.02,2010 07:02:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	please keep the beach open to surfing and or beach driving thank you.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	92	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.02,2010 07:06:46						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern, I agree we must preserve this delicate and beautiful area, but to ban access is not the answer. We must be able to access the beach for surfing, fishing, or just to stroll down the beach at sunset. Please make a practical decision and continue to let people enjoy this wonderful area. Thank you, Pete in Naples						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	93	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	fentress, matt						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.02,2010 07:47:03						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This beach closure issue is totally irresponsible. Most of it is based on ideology and not science. I would like a count on how much wildlife is killed directly related to driving on the beach. It does not exist, and any stat can persuade ones ideology. It is a sand bar people! Of all the concerns in the world, people need to really look at their priorities.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	94	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	whalen, michael						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.02,2010 07:51:36						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Wildlife is impacted mostly by natural conditions/weather ect. not fisherman, bathers, sightseers and ORV's. I know of a school roof and a private driveway many miles away from the the coastline that has more piping plovers than cape point ever has or will have. Please do your due dillagence/ research before passing laws. The impact/ cost to public benefit equation just doesn't add up by some peoples way of thinking.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	95	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.02,2010 08:06:51						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think you should really evaluate what it is you are doing. The problems I foresee in your solution are really flawed and present no real solution. Or at least a logical solution. The problems with the Cape Hatteras National Seashore are attributed to lack of appropriate access. First of all, you provide little or no access for the public, thefore you have surfers, bird wathcers, and general beach goers parking on the side of the street. (Not Safe) If the Park Service had their way they would close the beach. Just remember who gave you the property, locals of the villages here. Most of the problems that occur are attributed to people living on these islands, not by people accessing the beach and surrounding areas. These ribbons of sand are perpetually in motion, don't forget that! So, what would be the best decision? You should allocate parking spots for access to certain areas. Remove Highway 12 North of Rodanthe and replace with a bridge type structure that could be moved when erosion threatens. Not only would this be easier than placing sand in area to be eroded and never regained, but would also be a solution to create an environment more friendly to wildlife. This would also, create a mechanisim to coontrol access to our beaches and waters. So lets pull our finger out and start thinking.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	96	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	garber, jeff						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.02,2010 08:21:16						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	surfing and campin on cape hatteras island is a family tradition, one that I Jeffrey Garber am willing fight for. My father, brother, and I have been traveling to the outer banks since i was a baby. The respect we have for the ocean and the environment comes from the deep within our hearts, and we are willing to obey certin rules, but no access is out of the question! I love the outer banks! please dont take it away! i live for the times i spend on the island.... not to mention all the money the DARE county would loose, not from tourism but from traffic violations, most of them are Virgina plates that pay the fines...I am open to the proposition to create awareness about the habitat and the environment and to teach people the importance of respect and non intrusion.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	97	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.02,2010 08:31:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm all for respecting the environment and wildlife, alot of it makes the outer banks the great place it is. I also don't deny that the surfline article might be leaning a little to one side. However, from what I've gathered, i completely agree with it. The only medicine will be to respect the dunes, the birds, and the wildlife. Why not slow down invasive rental housing development? Cut down on tourism, and slow the trash on the beaches, It's only people who disrespect the island that are causing the problem, and I don't see why everyone should be blocked out.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	98	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.02,2010 08:42:12						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have grown up in NC, around the coast, my entire life. Access to our fishing holes, surf breaks, and beach areas in general is of the utmost importance. Research has shown that the plovers contribute very little to our ecosystem and furthermore, 93 of 100 incidents with plover nests were from state employees, not tourists. Are we really willing to loose million\$ in commercial and tourism revenue simply b/c we cannot control a few bad apples? Please, protect nature but do so in a way that doesnt ruin responsible humans lives. Thank you						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	99	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
---------------------------	----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------	-----------------	---

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 08:45:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To restrict access to a national treasure would be to defeat the very purpose of that treasure. It would in effect, result in a impoverished generation lacking the scope and breadth of all that "Banks" have to offer, and In my opinion: The results will not foster great awe and respect of God's creation, and all of the care, with stewardship that it entails. NO! KEEP THE BANKS "OPEN" Its only because of my experience "as a native of North Carolina" and resident of Florida, spending time exploring the the outer banks that I take this time to share my thoughts, of how important it is to continue to allow the treasure to be explored, revered and protected. The single most important factor in protecting the banks as a sanctuary for wildlife and people is not to erect gates; but rather, change minds and hearts through steadfast dilignece to education and a personal experience, that makes life long impact on those who are apart. Change comes from the inside out.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 100    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 08:53:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First of all,like many others, I have been spending my summers and countless weekends on the outer banks of North Carolina. Some of my fondest memories were made driving down the beach's of Hatteras with my family. I learned to surf there, went on my first date, and even learned to drive. I completely understand the need to shut certain spots on the beach at points for shore life nesting and other wildlife preservation. Preserving shorebirds and turtle habitats and nesting grounds is very important and we are responsible for doing so. Though we must shut parts of the beach I don't feel the need to stop all traffic on all spots. Being able to drive onto the beach is a favorite pastime on the outer banks and attracts many tourist, fisherman and even locals to come spend the day out, grab some lunch from a beachside restaurant, and maybe even stop in a beach shop and do some shopping. Beach access helps support the economy on the banks and in Hatteras, there's no question about it. Because this is such a money maker the county should be willing to put some of that money back into protecting the beaches while keeping them open. Maybe we could hire a few more lifeguards to patrol the car accessible beaches on 4 wheelers and act almost as beach traffic police. Surfline was right when they said it's an island full of drive thru brew stations and some people tend to get rowdy and take it out on the beach with their trucks. Will they still want to do this when threatened with constant patrol and a Hefly fine? Beach access is a privilege, if someone is caught breaking the rules then their license plate should be taken and there privileges should be revoked. We shouldn't all be banned because someone thought a sand dune resembled a monster truck jump. We must save both wildlife and the public beach. Both are vital to the outer banks economy. Sure it would be easier to shut all the beaches, but you might as well shut down the whole set of barrier islands in that case because they aren't going to be able to support themselves. A solution somewhere in the middle must be found.  
S.O.S- Save Our Surfspots

---

**Correspondence ID:** 101    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Towersey, Chad s  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't restrict access to the outer banks. Unless it is causing a major disturbance to the ecological system, or is causing deaths to man kind. If not, let what has been be. If its not broke why fix it? There are plenty of other issue they should be focussing on than shutting access to a beach. May be focus improving water quality.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 102    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 09:12:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep access open, public & free for the hatteras national seashore. My family has been enjoying this national treasure & special place for over 35 years. Surfing, fishing, shelling, hiking, etc. Do not ban!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 103    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 09:33:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Closing the beaches to vehicles will devistate the local economy. The reason most people go onto the island is to experience the isolationism they can't find up in nags head. Beach access is what keeps everyone down there working. Without that access all the visitors will stay up in town. For the most part, people drive their vehicles on the beach in a respectful way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 104    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, sean  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 09:36:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative C is by far the best option. Leave access open to surfers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 105    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 09:39:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This I know. Our environment is in peril. Experts agree, all coral reefs could easily be extinct by the end of this century. I am in favor of doing what it takes to protect all natural resources. Last year was my first visit to Hateras since before I can remember, and I am now 37. I live in the mountains, another example of rampant over developement. From a purely selfish standpoint it sucks when condos get built where we used to rock climb. However, I know we did far less damage- practically no impact compared to dinamite and bulldozers. I believe that sensitive areas can be managed by parks and recreationalists alike with the goal of preservation in mind. I do not claim to be an expert but I have seen a lot of impact on our coasts and mountains. There is a right way and a wrong way, I hope that people realize that surfers are environmentalists with the best intentions: the hope that future generations can enjoy what we did responsibly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 106    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gruver, Marcus H  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 09:41:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love driving, fishing, and surfing on the beach. I understand that we need to be responsible for taking care of, and preserving our environment. I am willing to accept driving on limited beach accesses. However, I would like to see more public street parking and beach access where former ORV use is

restricted. It would be tragic to be denied the experience of such a great aesthetic beach that is the Outerbanks. The very reason myself and many of my friends, vacation and surf there every year. Marcus Gruver Brigantine, NJ

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	107	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, Michael J					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 10:04:44					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I feel it is imperative that a solution be found which still enables and maintains beach access for fisherman, nature enthusiasts, and the surfing community. The evidence that beach access is endangering bird and turtle habitat should be studied further and empirical evidenced provided. Alternative solutions to overall access restriction need to be developed. Most of us who drive on the beach to fish and surf or just relax and get away into one of nature's most beautiful surroundings never wants to endanger any of the animals or the beach at large. There may be the very rare drunken fools that fly around like idiots out there but the majority of us are respectable, nature loving people and access to this pristine environment in some form is a right we deserve. I used to live on North Padre Island in Texas where there is the Padre island national seashore with the Kemps Ridleys. Out there they have still managed to maintain 4wd beach access while doing their best to protect the sea turtle nests through active daily and nightly patrols during nesting season. Where does one draw the line? It could easily be argued that driving on the park highway parallel to the beach is just as damaging or so are the development,etc... We are human beings and our ingenuity should enable us to interact peacefully with the environment while preserving our rights for beach access.</p> <p>thank you</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	108	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 10:09:27					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep the access open. Dont change/ruin the outer banks.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	109	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 10:09:36					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>We mini vacation approximately twice a year to the Nags Head area and much enjoy walking the beach. Without the walks we would probably not make the drive.</p> <p>As for vehicles on the beach we could do without them.</p> <p>Paul Clancey</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	110	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 10:41:34					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>it isnt right to deny people access to some of the most beautiful beaches on the east coast. the outer banks has meant so much to my family and we dont want to see it closed. theres ways you could make improvements..dont allow vehicles onto the beach. ive surfed outer banks for 8 years and its my favorite spot still and ive been all over the world. dont close the bank!</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	111	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 11:34:35					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I believe this whole monstrosity to be a terrible act of non local concern. I agree with the fact that these wildlife animals' lives are in need of security to tourists and those taking advantage of the ability to drive on our beaches. BUT, there is no reason to close the whole accessibility to those that respect the territory and act upon that. There are two kinds of people in this matter, those that are not aware of the wildlife issues that take advantage of the area; and there are those that either live there and put in effort to protect their home. I think that in order to get the most out of both sides, we will need to respect both parties and take action towards an equal outcome. To locals, this is why they live there, the beaches, fishing, surfing, and wildlife. To the outside wildlife preservatives, if you actually live there, you will see that; for the most part, the problem is not the locals, its the tourists and non caring people that visit these beaches that take advantage of them and do not respect the land. So, what I suggest, is all you turtle huggers, go on and let the local towns take action towards these issues. We do not need you and your non local ideas to preserve what most locals live in this area for. This is there land and I believe that since these issues have risen, we can gather a plan to better protect these beaches that I have been raised around and love. If you turtle huggers have such an issue with turtles, go to Costa Rica where there is a greater issue of this topic. I cannot stand people that try to come into areas where they do not live or know much about and try to politically change the ways of the lands.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	112	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 12:30:13					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>To whomever this concerns:</p> <p>As an extremely frequent visitor to the Cape Hatteras beach areas, it is very concerning that much of the coast line could be closed. I support the effort to protect the wildlife in the areas that will potentially be closed. However, many of the locals and those who visit for recreation will be substantially affected by these closures. As a surfer, Cape Hatteras serves as a destination and a source of fantastic waves, which are already scarce on the east coast. Cape Hatteras is the mecca for east coast surfers, as many make the trip north or south to explore and find great uncrowded waves in one of the most beautiful settings possible. To deny access to many of the best sandbars during the most active times of the season would be a massive blow to the surfing community and recreational community as a whole.</p> <p>If it is possible, all access should be granted with more highly regulated restrictions. It would be beneficial to monitor whether or not those who drive on the beach or attend the beach frequently actually have a significant effect on the wildlife in those areas. It is possible that recreational users have very little impact on the issues which have raised concern for the beaches.</p> <p>Beach closures for an area that is a rare east coast surfing oasis would be tragic and everything should be done to keep these areas healthy, protected and open for people to appreciate.</p> <p>Very Respectfully, Brett Fox</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	113	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Albert, Kelsey					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,02,2010 12:52:35					

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,  
 Concerning the Closure of The Outer Banks Beaches to human access in order to preserve bird habitat:  
 I grew up in the region of the Outer Banks, NC and spent many of my early years enjoying the beaches there with my family. This was an important part of my appreciation for nature, by directly interacting with it, I learned to love it, appreciate it, use it responsibly, and protect it. I have dove the OBX, fished it, boated, kayaked, and spent a great deal of money at the federal camp grounds and other tourist attractions there over the years. I am now in California and still return to that region to enjoy the beach access by ORV. To be able to use the beaches is why I return there and choose not to take vacation in other places.  
 I surf and dive those beaches. I also enjoy viewing the other critters that inhabit the dunes, such as lizards, other birds, and the plant life. These areas are important access points for many beach-related activities. With many regions across the US already taking away opportunities for outdoor enjoyment, it would be horrible if this area were added to the list.  
 I understand the need to protect the habitat of wild birds - as a life scientist, I understand this. But complete closure of our beaches is unacceptable and unnecessary. I would be open to closures during crucial breeding weeks/months, but under no circumstances would it benefit the birds any more to close the beaches year round. I am also open to creating fenced zones for the birds or creation of habitat.  
 I want to be able to return to these beaches for many years for my family's future generations to enjoy - so that I can have them enjoy our heritage and natural resources by direct interaction. The birds have been breeding fine for hundreds of years of human interaction - it is unreasonable to close the beaches to human access. A compromise between conservation and beach access is something I would support.  
 Thank you for your time and consideration,  
 Kelsey Albert

---

**Correspondence ID:** 114    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Metcalf, Prescott W  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 13:39:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the beaches open to public use specifically fishing, surfing, and other recreational uses. Consider permits, fines, passes, etc. to help control the amount of people who drive the beach. Also consider doing more tests to prove what exactly needs to be done with control over the areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 115    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** De Lille Wright, Jadie R  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 15:55:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see Alternative C go into place. Please don't fully close the beaches, I accept some sections, but doing so would more than likely kill business and make the economy plummet.  
 Thanks  
 Jadie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 116    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 16:00:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who was born in North Carolina and returns to vacation frequently, just thought I'd say chime in on the whole OBX shore restriction vote. In my opinion you should really make sure that there is still access for surfers, swimmers, kayakers, etc. Don't limit something so special for everyone for just a few mistakes. I understand the point to protect the environment, but you still need to have access for these sport pursuits that are meant to be enjoyed in the ocean and not hurt it. The ocean is meant to be shared and enjoyed, not restricted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 117    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Podolak, Robert  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 17:05:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Comment re: Beach Access on Hatteras Island  
 We support continued beach access (within the reasonable constraints of wildlife habitat). We have fished and birded on the beaches of Hatteras Island for over 35 years. The villages and the residents of Hatteras depend on income from visitors who access the beaches, currently with four-wheel drive vehicles. A balanced approach to shared beach access for fishing, birding, nesting, and general recreational use would be ideal. Certain areas (Cape Hatteras Point and Hatteras Inlet for example) require vehicles for any reasonable access for fishing.  
 Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes wrote in 1938 the following excerpt - one that applies today: "When we look up and down the ocean fronts of America, we find that everywhere they are passing behind the fences of private ownership. The people can no longer get to the ocean. When we have reached the point that a nation of 125 million people cannot set foot upon the thousands of miles of beaches that border the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, except by permission of those who monopolize the ocean front, the I say it is the prerogative and the duty of the Federal and State Governments to step in and acquire, not a swimming beach here and there, but solid blocks of ocean front hundreds of miles in length. Call this ocean front a national park, or a national seashore, or a state park or anything you please - I say that the people have a right to a fair share of it."  
 To view beach access as a one or two dimensional issue between fishermen and environmentalists diminishes the opportunities available to protect and enhance this national seashore. How we as human beings continue to interact with our environment while trying to live and recreate is a constant balancing act between multiple factors that require vision and leadership on the part of our National Park Service (NPS). Barrier Islands are a good example for us to witness the fragile, vulnerable and constantly changing nature of "Mother Nature". Our NPS needs to think "out-of-the-box" and come up with a plan that can enhance public access to the beaches while protecting the plants and animals there.  
 The issue of beach access, as important as it is to the current view of the Outer Banks economy and life style, is equaled in importance as the need to embrace change, for example in the establishment of paved (bike and pedestrian) paths and more dune walkovers. Perhaps expanding access in other areas will take pressure off the need for vehicle access. In other words, building paths in the Island villages and along Hwy 12 could encourage, and result in, less vehicle pressure on the beaches. The dune walkover, south of Frisco, is an example of how the Park Service has both encouraged the use of the Island beach without vehicle usage and has provided protection to the vulnerable dune system.  
 We wanted to voice the opinion that paved paths on the Outer Banks will positively impact the way people can experience our beloved area and will enhance and help serve to maintain the culture of laid back fishing villages. These are long overdue and we hope the Park Service recognizes their potential and comes forward in strong support.  
 These paths are looking positively to the future and will help maintain the beauty of the past history of the islands, (not to mention the healthy lifestyle that needs to be encouraged). In Colorado the Summit county area of the Rocky Mountains (Breckenridge, Frisco, Keystone, Copper Mountain and Vail) are all interconnected by over 100 miles of bike paths that are 95% off the highways. The businesses there would be fast to admit that bikers are a huge source of income for the summer months. Sounds like a "win-win" to us.  
 We appreciate the opportunity to make these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 118 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Weber, Robert A  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 17:32:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First let me start by saying that I am not from North Carolina but have traveled there on many occasions. I am only writing this letter because I care about our civil liberties and freedoms. More and more I see America's freedom diminishing, due to rules and regulations placed upon us by our fellow men and women in societies, political parties, and other areas of high ranking officials. I respect nature and would never want to see animals or natural habitat maliciously harmed. This is wrong and should not be tolerated. I do feel however that people should come before the animals. we are higher on the food chain, and therefore take precedence. Let people fish, let them surf, find better ways to park the cars and continue to let people enjoy themselves in a respectable manner. As far as the audubon goes, they dont want any humans even near the water or anywhere else animals live. if it was up to them we would probably be banned from all beaches, lakes, rivers, mountains, glaciers, caverns, ect..... you see where I am going with this. This society has potential to do good, but not by regulating the public so much in regards to the beach that they simply give up and never come back. this could have an impact on small business located near the obx and surrounding areas. Give people this freedom, to many others are already gone, and when they are taken away, its hard to get them back  
Robert Weber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 119 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 18:23:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** more research!  
DO NOT MAKE LONG TERM DECISIONS FOR SHORT TERM PROBLEMS!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 120 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 19:43:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a longtime and responsible vistor to the outer banks region,I would like to please ask that you do not restrict surf access along these shore lines but allow them to remain as they are . Thank you very much for listening. Bryan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 121 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 20:21:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been heading down to the OBX for years, fishing, surfing, and just hanging out, and there is nothing like an off-road excursion to find a beach to yourself in this day and age of overdeveloped coastline and monopolized beaches. It definitely gives the o.banks a different edge, which makes it the way it is to everyone lucky enough to have the resources, knowledge, and desire to explore and experience its true natural beauty. It would be a complete shame to see the detriment-- of a high level of restriction of ORV access on these beaches-- the local community would experience, and a great loss to East Coasters and OBX inhabitants alike. I'm certainly not saying efforts to preserve its spectacular natural beauty should be completely overlooked; i think it would be terrific if an optimal compromise could be achieved between conservationists and ecologists and the surfers, fishermen, and ORV enthusiasts who have the privilege of experiencing its beauty first-hand.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 122 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,02,2010 22:23:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Representative -  
Please do not restrict access to the Atlantic Ocean to anyone, anywhere, any time, for any reason. Cutting off miles of coastline to public access would be shameful and un-American. The Oceans are public domains, always have been, and always should be. I understand there are environmental impacts from ORV's, so perhaps limiting ORV access to certain areas would be understood. However, in lieu of that, coastal access should be allowed at all times to all surfers, fisherman, hikers, or anyone else who would like to enjoy nature's miracle in pursuit of happiness.  
Thank you,  
Dave Warga

---

**Correspondence ID:** 123 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** redwanski, jason e  
**Received:** Apr,03,2010 00:01:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a new jersey surfer,fisherman,and all around beach going person. I have grown up fishing and spending time on the beaches in new jersey and have been passing this love of the ocean onto my 10 year old daughter. I regularly buy my beach buggy permit for Island beach state park here in new jersey,and I follow all rules and regulations that are to be followed when on the beach. I have been coming to the outer banks for years and have now brought my fiance there for the first time in 2009 and she fell in love with the area and we now have vacation plans for july this summer. Last year while we were there we were on the beach where there was an area closed off do to the wildlife which we both agreed that it was a good idea to help preserve natures creatures, but after reading what is trying to be done it's upsetting. I would not like stop comming to the most beautiful friendly place I've ever been do to the fact that beaches are closed and not be able to bring my daughter there when I am able to and show her all the great things that I have fell in love with in North Carolina. Im hoping that when we get there that my fiance and I can enjoy the beach just as we did last summer.  
Thank you, Jason Redwanski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 124 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** redwanski, jason e  
**Received:** Apr,03,2010 00:02:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a new jersey surfer,fisherman,and all around beach going person. I have grown up fishing and spending time on the beaches in new jersey and have been passing this love of the ocean onto my 10 year old daughter. I regularly buy my beach buggy permit for Island beach state park here in new jersey,and I follow all rules and regulations that are to be followed when on the beach. I have been coming to the outer banks for years and have now brought my fiance there for the first time in 2009 and she fell in love with the area and we now have vacation plans for july this summer. Last year while we were there we were on the beach where there was an area closed off do to the wildlife which we both agreed that it was a good idea to help preserve natures creatures, but after reading what is trying to be done it's upsetting. I would not like stop comming to the most beautiful friendly place

0008797

I've ever been do to the fact that beaches are closed and not be able to bring my daughter there when I am able to and show her all the great things that I have fell in love with in North Carolina. Im hoping that when we get there that my fiance and I can enjoy the beach just as we did last summer.  
Thank you, Jason Redwanski

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	125	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.03,2010 00:02:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe full access to the outer banks for surfing should be preserved in all areas. Surfers are extremely environmentally concious and an activity like surfing is one of the specific reasons areas like the outer banks should be preserved. Other outdoor activities should be allowed as well. I firmly believe these types of activities can be done in an environmentally sensitive manner.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	126	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Allen, Ed				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.03,2010 05:59:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My wife and I make numerous trips each year to Buxton and Frisco. The last few years we have rented a cottage in Frisco for two weeks in July, and I'm looking forward to our two week vacation in Frisco this year. I am a dedicated surfer and I would just like to be assured that there will be plenty of places still available for me and the many others like me to persue our passion. One of the great things about OBX and surfing is that there is plenty of space to spread out and not get in each other's way. Many are the time times that I have complimented North Carolina and the way it manages it's beaches. My hope is that I will always be able to be complimentary and continue going to OBX. Otherwise I guess we might as well just stay in Virginia Beach. Ed Allen				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	127	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.03,2010 06:20:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras is a gorgeous and wonderful place that needs to be protected as much as possible while allowing full access into the ocean for surfers. I have visited many times going back to 1973 and I have fond memories of the people, the surf, and the wonderful beauty of the area. I support Alternative C as the best way to satisfy all parties.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	128	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.03,2010 06:46:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Closing the beach for public access is nonsense. I guess you guys should close down the entire eastern coastline since hurricanes ruin most of the coast. I have an idea to protect dunes. Build singel causeways to get over them with designated driving. I would support not driving on certain parts of the beaches, but to shut them down completely to surfing an fishing is just not right. Surfing especially since we are on the water not the dunes. I guess you guys could kill all the deer as well since they walk on the dunes or atleast fine them.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	129	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Blair, Edward				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.03,2010 06:50:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My family and I have been going to the OBX for many years. We are a beach family with several of us that surf. We live in Virginia, surf Virginia Beach and OBX year round. We typically go to the OBX every weekend during the summer months and several times in the winter. We also rent houses at the OBX and spend typically \$5,000 - \$7,000 on our summer vacation. The OBX represents the very last natural open beach on the east coast for us to enjoy its beauty and resolve. Closing these areas off to access will not only deter our visits and financial support to the OBX but will also do the same across the board with others. If everyone is so worried about keeping things natural why not let things alone and let nature take care of itself? Why is it that our self agenda organizations whom must make an impact somewhere to keep their donations coming in feel like they know what's best. Kind of like the Global Warming concept.....it's all about the money. If anyone really feels like they want to save any wildlife or solve beach concerns let nature take care of itself. Also someone needs to understand that humans are part of nature, and using the beach, swimming, surfing, is all natural. As for the vehicles are concerned, I am sure that there is some negotiable solution that would provide resolve for all. But closing these areas off certain times of the year to surfers is ridiculous. Surfers care more about the ocean and its surroundings more than any other self interest group possibly could. You see for the surfer the ocean is life, it represents the true meaning of living and the OBX is alive. Closing these areas even in a scheduled circumstance will be taking the life out of the OBX.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	130	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.03,2010 07:47:07						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	With no access by vehicle to the Cape Hatteras seashore how can my family enjoy the pristine beauty of the Outer Banks. The best part about the Outer Banks is the ability to experience an un-crowded section of the beach all to ourselves. If they close down these access points our decade long tradition of a week of surf & sun will go up in flames. I have already spents thousands of dollars to reserve a house for this July. What will we do at a National Sea Shore for a week with no access to the best surf breaks?						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	131	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.03,2010 09:12:21						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe that ORV access should be preserved alone the Cape Hatteras national seashore. Permits should be issued to help fund the preservation and protection of the wildlife. Plover fencing and protection areas with cross access should also be considered. The area is a national park and any citizen should have access to this national resource. what good is protecting an area if it can not be accessed or enjoyed? If access was denied then it might as well be taken off of all maps since it would be useless to anyone without access. Also consider the many industries that are involved. Tourism is Americas greatest industry, with out access no one can visit and there is no tourism where one can not go. Fishing, with out access this fishing mecca is not longer a mecca but a legend of long ago when you used to be able to go there. Surfing, one of the largest industries that want to recreate and deserve the access to do so, less invasive then fishing as surfers take nothing from the ocean but some waves. A happy medium of access, protection, and preservation can be reached. Permits are a good idea but make them available to all and reasonably priced.						

---

**Correspondence ID:** 132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.03,2010 09:18:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in the coastal VA/NC area all of my life and people have always been able to enjoy a trip to NC to take thier 4wheel drive out onto the beach. Not to go tear up the beach, Not to go cause trouble, but to enjoy the natural undeveloped coast and maybe alittle surfing or fishing while there. If you take away the ability for people to travel to these areas via 4wheel drive you also cause major harm to the small business owner who thrives off of the surfing and surf fishing market. The charter boats dont keep these shops in business and the piers have thier own shops. You also impact the restuarants etc. that make a livelyhood serving beach going customers. If you take away draw to the area you are taking away people from a market already impacted by the economy. If you take away tourist you loose local business. If you start to lose local business you risk destroying the once stable local economy in some of these areas that are dependant on tourism. For decades people have driven the shores of NC, Not only tourist but also residents of NC and neighboring states. It may not be land that we own but we all feel ownership in a sence that have lived here and enjoyed these beaches all of our lives and for any group of individuals that are not part of that ownership or native to the area to come in and mandate its use seems criminal. What next the harmfulfull effects of suntanning lotion on the enviroment... We will all be banned from wearing suntan oil at the beach. Draw the line in the sand and refuse these over conservative groups. We need to leave the beach open and not take away from what is the OuterBanks life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.03,2010 09:38:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a surfer. I have surfed the outer banks and Hatteras seashore my entire life. I rarely drove on the beach and have since a young age felt uncomfortable doing so. Now with this issue being raised, I have spent time reflecting on why I always feel somewhat uneasy driving on the beach. I feel uncomfortable because I know its a park, plain and simple, its a natural place. I don't drive vehicles around on natural areas in any park, anywhere on civilized earth. Not just because its illegal in all those locations, but because its absolutely irresponsible, and spoils these places, places set aside to remain free of unnatural things.  
Can we drive ORV's and ATV's all over the Jefferson National park? First Landing state park? or Yosimite? Or drive over all the wilderness along the applachian trail? Or how about central park in NY?  
Should we drive all these as well?  
Why is the Hatteras seashore different from these locations? Because its a beach? Because people have been allowed to do it in the past? It is absurd to think that we keep doing something just because we are doing someting.  
Lets start treating this place as special, as a national park and wildlife refuge, it is one.  
When I want to hike the mountains of NC, I expect to park in a remote location and hike or walk. This keeps things that cannot tread lightly (vehicles) away, and keeps the lighter treading vehicles (humans) mobile throughout the park.  
There's a lesson from Monterey California, some of the most beautiful seaside wilderness in America that also enjoys some of the best surf spots and beaches. You park a mile or 2 outside the preserve and have to walk in, board in hand for surfers.  
Hatterras is a very special place, close to me, my family, and many others. Lets start treating like a special place, and not a street or alleyway.  
NC can now start acting like it takes its piece of earth seriously, rather than treating it like a highway or street system, unbounded, careless in the way it liberally gives away its few natural resources and places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.03,2010 09:38:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a surfer. I have surfed the outer banks and Hatteras seashore my entire life. I rarely drove on the beach and have since a young age felt uncomfortable doing so. Now with this issue being raised, I have spent time reflecting on why I always feel somewhat uneasy driving on the beach. I feel uncomfortable because I know its a park, plain and simple, its a natural place. I don't drive vehicles around on natural areas in any park, anywhere on civilized earth. Not just because its illegal in all those locations, but because its absolutely irresponsible, and spoils these places, places set aside to remain free of unnatural things.  
Can we drive ORV's and ATV's all over the Jefferson National park? First Landing state park? or Yosimite? Or drive over all the wilderness along the applachian trail? Or how about central park in NY?  
Should we drive all these as well?  
Why is the Hatteras seashore different from these locations? Because its a beach? Because people have been allowed to do it in the past? It is absurd to think that we keep doing something just because we are doing someting.  
Lets start treating this place as special, as a national park and wildlife refuge, it is one.  
When I want to hike the mountains of NC, I expect to park in a remote location and hike or walk. This keeps things that cannot tread lightly (vehicles) away, and keeps the lighter treading vehicles (humans) mobile throughout the park.  
There's a lesson from Monterey California, some of the most beautiful seaside wilderness in America that also enjoys some of the best surf spots and beaches. You park a mile or 2 outside the preserve and have to walk in, board in hand for surfers.  
Hatterras is a very special place, close to me, my family, and many others. Lets start treating like a special place, and not a street or alleyway.  
NC can now start acting like it takes its piece of earth seriously, rather than treating it like a highway or street system, unbounded, careless in the way it liberally gives away its few natural resources and places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 135    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.03,2010 10:25:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** my family and i have vacationing (surfing fishing etc)on the outer banks for the last 10 yrs. It has become a summer ritual for us. One of the most significant reasons is access the beachess, surfing, fishing and 4 wheeling, are why the outerbanks is unique and enjoyable. please do not restrict access to this ocean paradise

---

**Correspondence ID:** 136    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr.03,2010 10:34:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think it would be ashame to deny access to these beaches from surfers, fisherman, and beach lovers. The Outer Banks is a special place like no other in the world. I have no problem with having to purchace a special "day pass" or "yearly pass" to still be able to enjoy these beaches. Please consider the livelyhood to the local business in the area and how they would be impacted if this law was put in place. As a North Carolina native I visit the Outer Banks at least three times a year and always for a week in the summer and love to find a secluded place to surf and enjoy time on the beach with my family.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	137	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,03,2010 11:59:54						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please, Please, do not close access to this beautiful beach.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	138	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,03,2010 13:45:09						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alternative C based on my reading of the proposed regulations.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	139	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,03,2010 15:18:10						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I grew up going to Cape Hatteras for family trips. The past 5 years it has been a second home for me when i was not attending school. With that being said i noticed last year that tourism, especially for fishing had greatly decreased when Cape Point and other beaches along Cape Hatteras National seashore where closed. Bottom line, keep the beaches open they way they where before The Audubon Society and other groups took the National Park Service to Court. The National Park Service was doing a fine job of regulating ORV use on Cape Hatteras, by protecting wildlife, yet leaving the beaches open for the publics use. After all that is what Cape Hatteras National Seashore was intended for in the first place. Its a shame that these special interest groups care more about a birds well being than they do about the well being of the inhabitants of Hatteras Island.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	140	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, Chris						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,03,2010 17:22:10						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep Hatteras Sea Shore open to the public. Without beach access there will be less reason to preserve our shores. Citizens will be less likely to care if our beaches are exploited if they are not allowed to visit them.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	141	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,03,2010 18:09:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Collin Ruppert. I am the grandson of Sarah "Sally" Ruppert. She is the person responsible for starting the piping plover conservation in my area. She started an accossiation called Volunteers for Wildlife. She was also one of the first presidents of the Autobahn Society. I spent most of my young life, as did my father, learning about and protecting our wildlife. Many areas of beach have been closed off to the public in our area as well as the outer beaches of North Carolina. As a passionate wildlife lover as well as a passionate surfer I am placed in a difficult decision. It seems to me that more study should be put into the actual affects that beach vehicles have on the piping plover population. It would be a travesty to close off beaches to people who love them and make a living from them without solid evidence that they are actually causing damage to the area or its wildlife. These beaches mean so much to so many people. Closing the beaches would be devastating to many people unless it can be shown that they are being closed for good reason and that the reasons are backed by substantial evidence. Thank you for allowing me to speak my opinion. Sincerely, Collin Ruppert						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	142	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,03,2010 21:36:43						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras is a wonderful place that strives on its access to the beach and the water surrounding it. Taking away access to the beach will hurt Hatteras in many aspects. Many of the locals make a living off the water and limiting them in anyway will hurt the local economy. Going to and being on the beach is one of the main attractions the this area. If there are no scientific tests correlating destruction to nest because of motor vehicles, then why blame the cars. Understand the cause and effect of the issue before taking action.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	143	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,03,2010 21:42:44						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras is a wonderful place that strives on its access to the beach and the water surrounding it. Taking away access to the beach will hurt Hatteras in many aspects. Many of the locals make a living off the water and limiting them in anyway will hurt the local economy. Going to and being on the beach is one of the main attractions the this area. If there are no scientific tests correlating destruction to nest because of motor vehicles, then why blame the cars. Understand the cause and effect of the issue before taking action. If taking away beach access has to be done, make sure it is in areas that are not popular locations for the people that come to enjoy Hatteras and what it has to offer. Im sure there will be a vote on what areas to limit access to, so make sure to listen to the people that know the area because there opinions are very valuable.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	144	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,03,2010 22:17:09						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to support alternative C of the proposed changes; I am most concerned with restriction of beach driving for recreation, specifically surfing and surf fishing. While my motives are selfish, the outer banks economy stands to suffer if beach driving is limited. Additionally, with a paucity of scientific data that supports the need for specific restrictions on beach driving, it is irresponsible to pass legislation or enact rules that will undoubtedly do harm, when the alternative may not. Thank you for your time. Andrew (Trey) Black,III,DPT,OCS						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	145	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,04,2010 00:37:40						

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please be reasonable. Closing the Outer Banks beaches to driving will devastate the surfing, fishing, and birding economies, to name a few. Buxton isn't Daytona Beach, where you can pull into a parking lot just about anywhere and not have to mosey more than a couple hundred yards to your final destination. Recognize that you have a tremendous resource to manage, and please do so appropriately. It makes sense to ensure that Bubba doesn't drive over a sea turtle with his 33" lift and 6 beers in his belly. Banning the responsible recreation of the very advocates that work tirelessly to protect the coastline does not. I'm sure that sensibility will prevail. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 146    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Santiago, Omar  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 05:50:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** HI,as a member of this community me and my family are totally against the closing of our beaches.The federal gov. needs to back off of this project wich will affect the lifes of more people than birds and acknowledge that theres no real evidence that we are killing these birds by using are beaches.

**Correspondence ID:** 147    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 07:54:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been traveling and vacationing in the outer banks since i was a little kid. My family has had a house in Nags Head since the 60s, im 22 years old and my family loves to surf. Our house is actully on the sound which is nice and relaxing, but also means to go to the beach we have to load up our vehicles and lug everything over the dunes to the beach. The sandbars the outerbanks has to offer compared to surrounding areas on the east coast are second to none...and the fact that once you get on Pea island you can use the beach accesses to drive your 4x4 out on the sand is worth the 2 hour drive from va beach. I think that the wildlife does need to be protected, but I do not agree with the closure of every beach access during peak tourist season. Im sure you have already recieved many emails like mine wishing for the beaches to stay open, but i know you are also handling emails that wish for the beaches to be closed to protect the wildlife. Most of the local economy in those smaller towns would deffinitely feel the effect of the beach closers. Have you ever seen how crowded frisco beach gets on july 4th? all of those people have to refuel and re-bait or re-load on beer, and guess what...they wont be spending that money in the local stores, which i know you are also aware of. just asking if its worth it to you all if saving a few birds and turtles is worth destroying an economy. The turtle nests should be marked a little better during peak tourist season as well...a rising tide from a late season nor'easter or a tropical depression could wash away most of the little orange flags that are used to indicate turtle nests. please do not close the beach acceses! -matt

**Correspondence ID:** 148    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hinkle, Mark  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 08:04:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I understand that this is a complicated issue, but the only way to educate people relies within experience. I was walking on a section of South Nags Head Beach a few days ago, and a gray seal had washed up on the beach (most likely to take a rest). Very shortly after this, a couple marked off a 50x50 yard perimeter and carefully guarded it. They didn't want anyone coming close to the seal because it might scare the seal.. How does this tie in to the proposed issue at stake? Well, I feel that restricting beach access might reduce the possible number of these environmentally conscience citizens... It would seem that with very restricted access, only extremely adventurous persons (most likely young persons with time on their hands) would be able to scale the beaches to no end. These same types of people are not necessarily experienced and environmentally educated... there is no telling what they would do if they were alone with some kind of environmental factor present (would they attempt to play with the seal, or steal or contaminate the turtle's nest)... An even bigger reason why restricting access is a bad idea is because surfers would greatly suffer... Surfing is one of the only true available connections with nature, and to destroy any kind of access, or make it harder to take advantage of waves (that are already scare here in this part of the coast) would just be devastating... To all of you "environmentalists", please ask yourself, "How do surfers and surfing really affect the environment in a negative way?" I am very sure that the amount of leisure gained from surfing could greatly outweigh the slight increase in leisure that you environmentalists gain from greatly reducing vehicle access to the OBX beaches...

**Correspondence ID:** 149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 09:31:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative C on this project which will allow for a reasonable amount of access for surfing.

**Correspondence ID:** 150    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lengyel, John M  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 10:34:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam, I have been a long time vacationer in the Outer Banks of North Carolina and a 4 year resident at one point in my life. I appreciate the Outer Banks for the diverse wildlife, the uncompromised beauty and uniqueness of the landscape and the unrivalled surf that these barrier islands offer. I believe that preserving the islands for future generations is of the upmost importance. That being said, I feel strongly that preventing access to the beaches at any time for any reason does no one, including the wildlife and all parties in this process, any good. I have always been impressed by the lack of litter on the beaches in the outer banks. I have noticed on many occasions, surfers and fisherman alike, collecting trash from the beach and driving it out to be properly disposed of. I do not believe that litter contributes in any significant way to bird deaths in these islands. I also know that 88% of bird deaths relate to predators and weather. The other 10% is most likely the result of deaths on the highway (Route 12) leading into and out of the islands. That leaves 2% of deaths possibly related to beach traffic, and it is fact that the only confirmed bird death by vehicle is a case where a Federal vehicle ran over a nest. Are we going to limit beach access because 1 or 2% of bird deaths result from it? That seems to be a bit of an overreaction. In addition, there is no doubt that the impact of closing the beaches will significantly impact the ability of local businesses and residents to earn a living and provide for their families. Finally, it is obvious that the bird population on the island is thriving and will continue to do so. Perhaps requiring an ORV permit to fund additional impact studies and rangers to regulate beach traffic is all the regulation that we need. After all, 99% of people respect all signs denoting turtle and bird nesting areas and requiring a permit may keep that other 1% off the beaches. Let's keep the beaches open so that every generation gets to experience the beauty of the outer banks. The people who make their living here and the families that have been coming here for generations deserve and have the right to it.

**Correspondence ID:** 151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 14:30:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep all beach access as it is now.

0008801

However, I do support ORV permits to curtail wild behavior on the beach. The permits will cut down on some dangerous drivers and will help inform and remind EVERYONE who drives on the beach about rules, procedures and protected areas. Close ramps when needed to protect portions of the beach or nests.

Keep 24 Hour access as well.

Beach access benefits...

-Handicapped and elderly folks -Surfers (I am a surfer)This National Seashore is home to the best surfing on the East Coast. Taking beach access away will be devastating. -Fishermen/women and children (I also enjoy fishing at Cape Hatteras Nat. Seashore)

By limiting beach access, local business will see a drop in tourism as the Cape Hatteras Seashore loses the allurements that brings folks. Many families and individuals will simply choose other destinations. We cannot let this happen. Not today, not tomorrow.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 15:51:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the state park open with full access! That is one place I have not been and have had it on my list with every anticipation to visit and surf there!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 153    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 17:37:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** im all for FREE BEACH ACCESS, and im pretty sure last year in civics class the preamble of the constitution of the United States of America it says "we the people" not we the birds. Now come on you guys are killing the economy in hatteras to keep a few birds happy and most of the killings were due to the park service themselves. Im a regular at papa ninos pizza when ever i go down which is like every weekend, and he is stoked when i come in. I skim the point a lot and its one of my favorite breaks heres a video.  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mgR1T2zg2I>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 154    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 17:43:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an Outer Banks, NC resident, wildlife activist, extreme animal rights activist, and surfer, I believe even a temporary pedestrian closure to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a HUGE mistake. I for one, respect animals and wildlife to the absolute fullest. I also respect humans, as we are animals as well, who inhabit this planet and have rights to enjoy our planet just as much as any other species. Not only would a temporary closure to pedestrians to Hatteras cause a complete and utter upheaval in the local community, it's a recipe for economical meltdown on the Outer Banks as a whole. As I said before, humans have just as much right as birds or any animal for that matter, to enjoy the most pristine, beautiful strip of land on the entire eastern seaboard. I believe it's safe to say that 99 percent of people and visitors respect the wildlife and every other element on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 155    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 17:45:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an Outer Banks, NC resident, wildlife activist, extreme animal rights activist, and surfer, I believe even a temporary pedestrian closure to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a HUGE mistake. I for one, respect animals and wildlife to the absolute fullest. I also respect humans, as we are animals as well, who inhabit this planet and have rights to enjoy our planet just as much as any other species. Not only would a temporary closure to pedestrians to Hatteras cause a complete and utter upheaval in the local community, it's a recipe for economical meltdown on the Outer Banks as a whole. As I said before, humans have just as much right as birds or any animal for that matter, to enjoy the most pristine, beautiful strip of land on the entire eastern seaboard. I believe it's safe to say that 99 percent of people and visitors respect the wildlife and every other element on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 156    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McCarty, David T  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 18:05:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Outer Banks is one of the East Coast's best surfing treasures. While the need to limit access for nature reasons may exist, there are plenty of places for people to swi and bake in the sun, but the number of pristine surf spots is extremely limited. Please don't take this away. It would be a travesty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 157    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, Chase  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 19:53:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This would be a huge mistake. we all care about the safty and health of all wildlife, but limiting us from enjoying the beauty of the obx is just insane. this would kill much of the economy in these towns. when we put the health of a few hundred animals in front of the livly hood of other people, we are making a huge mistake. Ive gone to the obx hundreds of times and never ever ever killed, injured or even came close to hurting any kind of species. THINK BEFORE YOU DO SOMETHING STUPID

---

**Correspondence ID:** 158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Whitley, Jack w  
**Received:** Apr,04,2010 20:26:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please for the love of all seashore activites and surf let the beaches remain how they have always been ever since my grandfathers days of fishing and loving the ocean fishing and activites.My grandfather's name was Phillip Neal Thomas from Beaufort, NC. I am 53 and lived in the Salvo,Rodanthe and Buxton areas of the Outerbanks during the 70's and 80's.We cannot let the beaches come to such closures due to a few birds in which their lifecycle is as ours. We never know when our day is due to meet our maker but the birds are not being punished for living the cycle of life. Their home during the migration is our home always and we depend on our home to provide for us during our life's cycle needs. Happy Easter 4/4/10  
Jack Whitley

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	159	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Eggers, Scott					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,04,2010 23:38:18					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>What scientific proof as been obtained that substantiates the closure of beach access, especially to pedestrians. How many dead birds? Isn't this sponsored by the National Audubon Society. These groups are going too far in their quest to fence the country and lock Americans out. Would this law close access to the surf zone for surfers? When was the last time you saw or heard of a surfer harm wildlife. This sounds like more special interest propaganda to use the government for another land grab in the name of conservation.</p> <p>The last thing OBX needs is access lost and visitor use experience improvements in the form of more signs to tell the people what they're looking at. Why does the park service litter the natural environment with all of the signs? Think of what has become of Yosemite it has been turned into Disney Land. The signs are a form of visual pollution and OBX does not need to be turned into another Disney Land.</p> <p>I'd like to see the government use a little common when making these types of decisions that affect this, the very foundation of Americans liberty.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	160	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Wilson Jr, Clyde R					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,05,2010 04:23:14					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>We stay in the Outer Banks approx. 6 weeks a year and would like some sensible requirements put into place that would please the most people and still be environmentally responsible. I would like to cast my vote for alternative "C".</p> <p>Thank You Clyde Wilson</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	161	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,05,2010 06:41:49					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The killing of our island's foxes, raccoons, otters, minks, geese and other wildlife by the Park Service by way of shotguns, leg traps and poison gas for a non-endangered, non-indigenous bird is insane. We lost our cultural and historical heritage as well as millions of dollars in tourist dollars over bird eggs. The lack of science for closing the beach and ridiculous rules such as taking more land if a sign is kicked down or not holding any meetings of Hatteras Island to make it nearly impossible for locals to attend is insulting and wrong. There is no evidence that shows people being on the beach especially walking on the beach, hurts any animal and with no proof that people on the beach hurt these non-indigenous birds there should be no beach closure. If anything the presents of people on the beach keeps the number of predators on the beach down which are the biggest threat to the birds. Besides the Park Service drives up and down the closed areas year round while the rest of us cannot even walk out there. These same birds nest on the top of the sea mart in Nags Head and in Virginia Beach where millions of people frequent the beach so obviously the birds do not mind being near people. The Park Service should be ashamed of what they have done stealing this beach. People have lived on this island for thousands of years making the presents of people a part of the ecosystem. This bird is new to the area and we should not kill all the indigenous animals, the economy and our liberty for a few bird brains on a ji-had for the plover egg. I pick choice A if I had to but really all beaches should be open year round as was intended when the park was created in the first place.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	162	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Meekins, Scott					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,05,2010 06:51:44					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The local economy overall is suffering already and if you close the beaches it's not going to get any better. This past winter is the first one i've ever been unemployed the whole time. Whether it's related or not, it's an issue. I've lived here my whole life and my family is the same since the 1600's. We've never seen such disregard for our thoughts on something that effects us the most. I like birds and would like to see the piping plover do good but if it comes down to the bird or my livelihood then the birds gonna go. We're not the only place it nests. You close down the whole beach, dunes to the water when the bird doesn't nest anywhere near the water. We've always had tern nesting areas as long as i can remember and they were acceptable, nobody uses that part of the beach anyhow. Why would this little bird nest in the tide zone? Even if we had use of just the tide zone and a few more feet it wouldn't be so bad. In my eyes i see the audobon society which has 100's of times more members than we have total residents strong arming us into a situation which will crush our economy worse than it already is.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	163	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,05,2010 07:25:57					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I travel to the Cape Hatteras Seashore every year to surf. Please keep it open to access. I am also an avid swimmer and love to swim in the ocean. The water there is beautiful and deserves to be used by everyone. Thanks! Ryan</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	164	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,05,2010 08:41:46					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I support ORV driving on all NC Fishing Access Beaches.</p> <p>The claim that ORV driving is disrupting wildlife is unsubstantiated.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	165	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, danielle					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,05,2010 08:43:47					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>i think its just darn wrong.eg national park service should just leave obx and take the epa with them land of the free! my ass.....</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	166	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Jenkins, Pembroke N					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,05,2010 09:44:53					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The Peas Isand National Wildlife area has arguably some of the best surf on the East Coast. Surfers have traveled to that area for surf for the last forty years. Please keep the area open in some manner to allow access to this area. The Surfers are not hurting the birds.</p>					

**Correspondence ID:** 167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Acri, Mark J  
**Received:** Apr.05.2010 10:35:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm an avid fisherman and typically try to come down to Hatteras Island several times during the course of a year. I rent a cottage, and also frequent the local bait/tackle shops as well as restaurants. Being able to have access to the beach via 4wd is one of the main reasons I come. As that access has been limited the past couple years, so have my trips been cut back during the spring/summer when access is most restricted. This is definitely costing the locals, as I will typically spend between \$1000 and \$1500 for the week I'm there. So I can definitely say that the current policy has cost the locals at least \$4000 over the past 2 years coming from me. While I can appreciate the need to make some attempt to foster a good environment for endangered indiginous(and that is endangered, not threatend) wildlife, I'm not too sure about the 'science' being quoted to support the suggested closures. From everything I have read, there doesn't appear to be any solid evidence that the restrictions to access and expanded closure zones imparted by the consent decree and suggested in this document(compared to previous closure policy) are a necessity. I think the environmental impact of these closures are minimal with respect to the actual number of birds that are 'saved' compared to the negative financial impact on the community. And that doesn't even address the issue that these are not idiginous species, nor are the endangered. I think the previous method of controlling access based on the day to day observations of nesting activity and the smaller closure zone was a reasonable practice. While it still resulted in closures, and thus protected the wildlife, it was not as detrimental to the tourist business this island depends on. And while I was not happy to have certain areas of the beach shut down due to a small number of non-endangered species, I could live with that.

**Correspondence ID:** 168    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hamrick, Rob  
**Received:** Apr.05.2010 10:56:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Outerbanks is quite an amazing place. It is beautiful and peaceful. I hope that areas down there won't become restricted. It is awesome to be able to pull our car over and walk over some dunes and have miles of beach to yourself and your friends. It is so peaceful and an experience that i haven't found anywhere else, or so close to home. I hope that the beach won't become restricted. The peaceful and relaxing experience would simply disappear and would force people into more crowded areas. It would make the islands less peaceful driving people to vacation else where making putting a hard time on business owners. The vacationers are needed for their economy.  
If you want to restrict beaches make the driving on the beaches more restricted but don't take away the ability for people to walk over dunes and enjoy the beaches. Please let beaches continue to be opened to travelers on foot.  
There are also valuable surf locations that would be taken away with these restrictions. The east coast isn't known for having good surf. Out all of the surfing spots on the east coast the OBX has some of the best surf. These spots are very important to east coast surfers and vital. These waves provide power which isn't see else where on the east coast so often.  
88% percent of turtle death is due to natural predators, i feel bad for the turtles but with 12 percent coming from i guess humans, please don't completely shut down the beach. 12 percent while it could be lower, shouldn't be enough to completely shut down the possibility for us to use these beautiful areas. Don't take away such drastic changes.  
Take cars of the beaches, put more trashcans with animal safe lids on the beaches.  
Please don't take away the peaceful beauty of the Outerbanks and the great surf spots. There is a reason my family goes to the outerbanks multiple times a year.  
Sincerely, Rob Hamrick

**Correspondence ID:** 169    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.05.2010 12:12:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Since there's been no real scientific study connecting ORVs with bird mortality -- except the "Federal Vehicle" that ran over a nest a few years back -- and 88% of deaths is attributed to weather and predators, the NPS needs to keep studying how these closures are affecting species survival in hopes of looser, more reliable restrictions in the future.  
Of them all "Alternative C" seems to preserve the most possible access to the best surfing areas for the most time, while keeping some common sense ideas in place. (On an island filled with drive-thru beer stores, maybe requiring ORV permits will keep a few drunken yahoos from burying their Escalade in a turtle nest.)  
More and more access to "Public Lands" are being taken away or restricted from the public all across the USA.  
What's happened to "Public Land" being "Public Land" for use by the people..... we are the public!

**Correspondence ID:** 170    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** dillon-dawson, carol  
**Received:** Apr.05.2010 12:24:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was born in Buxton, NC in 1956. My ancestors were shipwrecked here, over 100, acres of property was stolen from my grandmother in 1953 by the National Park Service. She was offered \$10.00 an acre, she got a lawyer fought it and lost, was never paid a dime. We were also given false promises at that time, protect from the "intrusion of the ocean, help to maintain our highways, NEVER close our beaches. My civil liberties have been stripped away to the point that I don't feel like an American. How can a country support a Federal agency that murders animals to protect a bird egg? My option is for the Park Service to leave this island and give us back our property, but since that is not ging to take place , at least open our beaches, all the beaches, all the time, and let birds and turtles do what the food chain intended them to do, survive, the way human beings are now having to do on Hatteras Island. This is the first Recreational National Seashore Park, it was created to give PEOPLE the chance to enjoy beaches. I can tell you that the NPS is hated on this island. I don't allow them on my property and I currently have a lawsuit against you that will be filed in the next few weeks. The only option is to give the people of this country back their beaches and let the enviromentalists go back to the coastlines of KANSAS where they belong. There is a reason the word MENTAL is in the word enviromentalist! Carol Dillon Dawson

**Correspondence ID:** 171    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** dillon-dawson, carol  
**Received:** Apr.05.2010 12:35:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was born in Buxton, NC in 1956. My ancestors were shipwrecked here, over 100, acres of property was stolen from my grandmother in 1953 by the National Park Service. She was offered \$10.00 an acre, she got a lawyer fought it and lost, was never paid a dime. We were also given false promises at that time, protect from the "intrusion of the ocean, help to maintain our highways, NEVER close our beaches. My civil liberties have been stripped away to the point that I don't feel like an American. How can a country support a Federal agency that murders animals to protect a bird egg? My option is for the Park Service to leave this island and give us back our property, but since that is not going to take place , at least open our beaches, all the beaches, all the time, and let birds and turtles do what the food chain intended them to do, survive, the way human beings are now having to survive on Hatteras Island. This is the first Recreational National Seashore Park, it was created to give PEOPLE the chance to enjoy beaches. I can tell you that the NPS is

hated on this island. I don't allow them on my property and I currently have a lawsuit against you that will be filed in the next few weeks. The only option is to give the people of this country back their beaches and let the environmentalists go back to the coastlines of KANSAS where they belong. There is a reason the word MENTAL is in the word environmentalist! They have taken over this country and not for the better. It is insane to murder thousands of animals, that cannot fly back to an island, to protect a few bird eggs. When I tell people this story that come into my business, they think I am kidding with them, nobody believes that the NPS is that cruel and stupid. I will be attending all your workshops, we are planning a protest at the Raleigh location, with signs and media attention, hopefully being in Raleigh, the state capital. Governor Perdue will hear our side of this story and start to understand the stupidity of this and maybe offer some type of tax relief or refunds for the loss of business that every business on Hatteras Island has suffered since our beaches have been closed for the past two years. Carol Dillon Dawson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 172    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,05,2010 14:38:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the beaches open to ORV and foot traffic at all times like it has been since the beginning on the Outerbanks. Thanks Jim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 173    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Burns, Dave C  
**Received:** Apr,05,2010 15:15:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "Give the birds a break". How about giving the humans a break for a change! This problem does not remotely include recreational traffic on the beach. If it does so us the proof! The mortality problem has more to do with mother nature as WEATHER, YES WEATHER is your, the bird lover's problem! Who controls the weather, God and maybe this is his way to balance out nature. DON'T FOOL WITH MOTHER NATURE! Leave the beaches be, the birds have been fine since the creation of time and they are now.  
 Make them so cause directly related to that which they seek to prevent!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 174    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** awari, chamel  
**Received:** Apr,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It's Important that we put greater efforts in preserving our planet, which harbors, nourishes, and has been providing for us for thousands of years. Modernization does not mean we can neglect our planet, matter fact it should and must work with it and not against it. If we are truly advanced then we would not have needed to wait this long to realize the importance of our planet and its extremely complex and delicate operations.  
 The Quran gives protection to all living organisms, and it only makes sense that it should.  
 Peace be with you all

---

**Correspondence ID:** 175    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Caldwell, Thomas M  
**Received:** Apr,05,2010 21:27:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** For the majority of my life, I have been a resident and a taxpayer of the state of North Carolina. During that time, I have had the pleasure of traveling to various locations inside and outside of both the state and the country. Through all of my travels, the Outer Banks stands as one of the most unique places in the world.  
 However what value is the uniqueness of the Outer Banks, and the joy that it brings to the many visitors each year, if it is inaccessible?  
 I travel to the Outer Banks multiple times per year. Given that I live in Charlotte, the trip is not a short one, requiring well over 5 hours of driving in order to reach any specific point. I could not fathom making that trip if the beach access is further restricted or hindered.  
 Many places on the Outer Banks require ORV access in order for you to truly reach the beach/destination with sporting equipment and gear, whether it be for surfing, fishing, or other. Eliminating or further hindering ORV access would essentially make many parts of the Outer Banks inaccessible. Additionally, by further cutting off access to different beaches, the beaches that do remain accessible suddenly will have to absorb the overflow of people that can no longer spread out. Suddenly, you have a serene environment transformed into a tourist trap, where huge populations of visitors are relegated to the remaining areas. If the intent is to preserve the environment, then what essentially is now the impact on the beaches that remain open, but are now subjected to overcrowding? Moreover, how many US taxpayers, like myself, will cease to visit because the Outer Banks becomes less unique and more like an over-run tourist town, where swarms of people over-saturate the remaining accessible areas? I will then find it very hard to continue to support any further initiatives by the NPS with my voting rights, given that the NPS will essentially have removed the usefulness of the "park" that I most highly value.  
 Ultimately, I find that the proposition should continue to maintain as much open ORV access as possible. I do not find that the speculation by which further restrictions are being imposed reflect any foundation on scientific evidence. There has been no true scientific study connecting ORV use with bird mortality; if I am mistaken, please provide me with an article in a legitimate scientific journal. Additionally, the NPS must continue to expand any studies related to connecting the reduction of ORV access to improvements in species survival prior to implementing sweeping additions to the restriction of access, such as this. I disagree with the use of speculation when implementing such restrictions. There are numerous examples of non-factual speculation contained within "Table ES-1." "Habitat loss?could also occur indirectly" is a statement overflowing with nonfactual ambiguity. Could it occur or does it occur? Also, is there any proof that "vehicular noise could create unsuitable habitat for Seashore wildlife", or is that speculation as well (use of "could" again)?  
 I support the protection of the environment, but in this case, I do not believe sufficient factual evidence has been put forth to justify additional restrictions on ORV access. Therefore, I lend my support to "Alternatives A & B", assuming that factual evidence does not exist within unbiased, scientific journals (i.e. not the Audobon society publications, which are biased in this circumstance). If sufficient articles and evidence can be cited, then I will support the additional restrictions of "Alternative C." However, I am not convinced at this point that any such fact-based studies have been completed.  
 Sincerely,  
 (Thomas) Michael Caldwell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 176    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,06,2010 02:12:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I surf, but the animals were there first and deserve to retain their lives and their homes. There are other places to surf.  
 Thank you for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 177    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 09:28:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't close the beaches to surfers who DO respect their environment! We do more positives than any others in the ways of beach clean up and respect. Thanks, Kert Layton				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	178	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Hoyt, Roberto				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 09:59:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe that the beaches of Cape Hatteras should remain open and accessible to all surfers and fisherman. I am against any beach closures or 4 wheel drive restrictions. I believe there should be a severe fine for any individual using the beach improperly. There is no credible proof that beach driving impacts any of the beach's natural inhabitants. The Audubon society has no real interest in cape hatteras				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	179	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Coen, Jon				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 10:26:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am always in favor of protecting wildlife. In this case, however, I feel the Adubon Society is going way over the line. Visting the Outer Banks has long been a tradition for my family and myself. As a freelance writer and traveler, I have seen many places around the globe and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is among my favorites. I feel very strongly that keeping access to the National Park is very important to not only visitors, but the local economy. Surfing and fishing are a way of life. Perhaps Alternative C is the best answer, keep areas open but limit ORV traffic. I think there are better solutions than closing the National Seashore off.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	180	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 10:29:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not close the beaches at Cape Hatteras so that we surfers can have access to the surfing areas that I personally surfed for 45 years. Surfers are very eco-friendly and can abide by restrictions but keep the beaches open for us. I cannot say much for the beer-drinking rednecks or the abusive fisherman who fly down the beach just to be driving on the sand, whereas we surfers need the access to surf our favorite breaks which shift with the sandbars. Thank You, Ralph Wyatt				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	181	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 11:32:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think No Action Alternative A is the best alternative.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	182	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 14:27:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Where is the EIS for this area? Are there sensitive species living/breeding in the area? There are places on this earth that people need to leave alone. Is this one of them? No one group or groups have a right to disrupt an environmentally sensitive ecosystem. It belongs to everyone. Fishermen have fished out our seas for profit and left by-catch and trash in their wake, surfers demand access to every break but leave their mark on the beach with plastic water bottles and other throwaways. They need education on taking care of our sensitive areas if they want access. It is not just about killing a bird but disrupting these creatures natural rhythms. I vote to limit access to everyone. No driving in sensitive areas, limited by permit access to some areas and no access in areas that provide breeding/feeding habitat for native species is a responsible beginning.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	183	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 15:19:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Recommend that LEADERSHIP governing Cape Hatteras National Seashore effect a balance between beach access and protection of local wildlife and beach ecology. Good governance needs to be established. Find a balance between man, animal and planet.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	184	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	O'Brien, Edward J				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 16:12:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern: I live in Gilbertsville PA. My family has vacationed on the OBX both North, South, and in between for the past 20 years. My wife and I hope to retire there. It is very plain to see to anyone who takes the time to look and listen, that the local folks who live there, some for generations, have a great respect and love for all that makes up this wonderful place. I'm talking about stewardship here. The flora, fauna, everything. The people that live here need to put all these things together in order to make a living here. Tourism and recreation are the main drivers of the OBX economy. I truly wonder, if the tourism trade is eliminated, where the tax revenues will come from to replenish the local, state, and federal coffers. I have read a good bit of the DEIS and am appalled at the lack of concern for the folks who live there. The eventual destruction of their lives and livelihoods seem more important to Washington and the environmental special interest groups than recognizing the same folks for the lifetimes of stewardship that have to date maintained a very balanced ecosystem. In my opinion, the management of these local resources, including all wildlife and their habitats, by the same local folks who have lived here for generations are not acknowledged for their efforts anywhere in the DEIS. Who do the environmental special interest groups think have been safe guarding the environment on the OBX since it was declared a National Recreational Area all those decades ago? Long before there was a Federal Environmental Protection Agency or state environmental agencies. Tell me who maintained the local ecology during all those years? The answer is easy, the folks that these same special interest groups are trying to force out of their livelihoods, and eventually their homes, so that the OBX can be rescued from their care. After all these decades of stewardship what could the locals possibly know about maintaining a thriving ecoculture? This				

DEIS would seem to indicate that these folks have no idea what it takes to maintain an optimal environment for local flora and fauna, let alone fishing. The National Seashore and Recreation Area is not a test tube for environmentalists. It is a National Recreation Area that was meant to be shared and enjoyed by all our country's citizens. In this regard I have, as a supporter of the Outer Banks Preservation Association, contacted my federal senators and representatives and expressed my concern over what is taking place on the OBX. Someone has to have some common sense and see that these special interest groups are trying to turn the OBX into a Discovery Channel experiment in isolation. The removal of man from his environment in favor of turtles, birds and environmental studies. Not a peaceful co-existence that has been going on for hundreds of years but a big brother takeover in the name of wildlife and habitat protection. I can not stress strongly enough that all good citizens should do all that we can to preserve this place and its people and way of life for generations to come. Thank you for your kind attention to my comments.....EOB

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	185	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Sulcer, Carolyn				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 18:38:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I have been going to the Outer Banks for the last 39 years. While traffic has increased greatly, it is still a wonderful place to go to. We currently have a cottage in Avon.</p> <p>Closure of additional beach access would take away a lot of pleasure and enjoyment that this area brings. The parks are for the people of the US. All of the people. While it is very important to have places that stay wild and protect wildlife, the Outer Banks have been open to people since its creation. If the Outer Banks was the only place for wildlife to live without human contact that would be one thing. But it isn't. There are miles of beaches off of the Virginia coast on the Eastern Shore and Portsmouth Island right next door are extremely restricted.</p> <p>There are few places in the US that allow people to drive on the beach, why take it away.</p> <p>If funds is the main issue, then put into place a permit. It would create funds but still allow access. The full time citizens of Avon, Buxton and Frisco can not afford additional cut backs in access.</p> <p>SAVE THE BEACHES FOR HUMANS!!!</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	186	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,06,2010 22:31:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>We are against any further closures of beaches in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. My wife and I own two residential properties on Hatteras Island. The one in Frisco is strictly for investment, and is a full-time rental property for visitors. The one in Frisco is where we stay when we visit, and is available for rental at other times.</p> <p>The restrictions on beach driving have been a significant detriment to our rental seasons, especially in the Frisco house, which caters to small families and fishermen. I know it has also negatively affected many businesses in the area, as we know many locals and have been coming to Hatteras Island for over 35 years. Tourism is the major industry in the area, and the pending restrictions on beach access can do nothing but further damage it in a still-weak economy.</p> <p>The restrictions in effect prior to the latest regulations were sufficient to keep the beaches accessible yet controlled. There was a de facto code of etiquette on the beach, which was if effect, to quote the lyric of a popular song of a while back, "Everyone agrees that everything will work out fine." The people who live on and visit Hatteras haven't changed; the desire to over-regulate their/our beach access has.</p> <p>Wildlife have fared no better or worse since the closings, despite the wishes of the Audubon supporters - an organization I supported for 30 years but which I no longer do because they are on the wrong side of this issue. Not every place at every time can be 100% purely ecological, but the new regulations are draconian in most instances. Those in place previously were working to maintain a balance between people and animals. Please return to reason, and re-authorize them.</p> <p>Thank you, Paul Payton</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	187	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Vilardi, Sue D				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,07,2010 02:16:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am in support of ORV permits, but please do not close off access to great waves for surfers.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	188	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Blankenship, Stuart W				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,07,2010 14:45:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't allow over reactive conservation groups to deny us the ability to access the beaches on the Outer Banks. If 88% of all bird and turtle mortality is the result of the weather or predators you shouldn't even be considering the option of limiting access. This would have dire consequences for the tourist and fishing industry on the Outer Banks. Come on, it's time to stop all of this nonsense!!!				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	189	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Fortney, Clark				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,07,2010 19:13:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>There is absolutely no hard scientific data to support closure or limit access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As evidenced by your data some of the sequestered areas of protection have not had nesting(endangered) bird species in recent years.</p> <p>It is reasonable to assume a limited benefit to beach wildlife and birds his plan is enacted. On the other hand it is very reasonable to deduct, based on personal contact with local business owners nad residents, that human existence on the island would become endangered!</p> <p>Humans (beach driving) and wildlife have cohabited very well for well over sixty years. The vast majority of sportsmen are ethical and will treat nature with respect. This area, both the wildlife and humans will not benefit from more government intervention.</p> <p>I respectful request that the NPS drop this plan or any part of it so that both wildlife and humans can thrive.</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	190	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Broughton, Janet				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,08,2010 06:17:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Access to the beach by ORV is crucial to so many people who come to the outer banks for family vacations and fishing. Please consider NOT closing these beaches for the many who have come to love and enjoy it so much. With the world and economy in the state it is today, there are few simple pleasures that all people should be allowed to enjoy. Our nature. I personally think there are few people who want to harm the birds, but there is so much more there to enjoy for so many.				

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	191	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,08,2010 14:40:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Keep all the beaches available for our use. I would like to see Alternative A put in to action until unrestricted access to the beaches can be restored. If the regulations listed in the "Action Alternatives" are adopted the Outer Banks as we know it is no longer.</p> <p>A possible alternative that I don't feel is being addressed and is worth exploration is a public awareness campaign to allow the ORV and native species to coexist. Just a thought before we wipe away access to one of our nations natural jewels.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and please do the right thing and give the Outer Banks back to the people who care most for it.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	192	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Bland, Stephen D						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,08,2010 17:38:54						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Thank you for putting so much time and effort into the Management Plan and EIS.</p> <p>I have reviewed much of the document and wish to give my opinion that while I certainly want the NPS to maintain a high level of resource protection for the National Seashore, I also feel the various buffers should only extend to a distance from the water that will allow use of the seashore by people, year-round and for all of the shoreline.</p> <p>I do understand that ORV use should be managed and at certain times of the year be more severely controlled to help ensure protection of the dunes and the creatures that live there. However, from personal observation from the past 30 years of visiting Cape Hatteras at least once per year, for up to two weeks in April and May, I just do not understand the need to now completely close much of the beaches to people. We have as much right to use the beach as any bird or animal.</p> <p>I feel if the true aim of resource protection for nesting birds is to help these birds successfully breed and raise their young, an aggressive program aimed at controlling predators, along with maintaining a reasonable buffer around the dunes where they nest will do more to help than simply closing the beaches.</p> <p>Since I do not generally visit in the summer months when turtles are coming ashore I will refrain on comments pertaining to protection of turtles.</p> <p>Thank you. Steve Bland</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	193	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,09,2010 05:41:51						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Everyone has a right to Beach access. First it will be, to stop the fisherman in Vehicles, then the Surfers in Vehicles and then the Campers. Next it will be to stop all fishing, then no surfing and soon all you will have is an empty beach, then no walking the beach. Then who will enjoy nature? Stop the madness!</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	194	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,09,2010 07:30:53						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>This really makes me sad that my family tradition for the past 20+ years may come to an end if driving on the beach is no longer allowed. My family looks forward every year to this vacation just riding up on the beach and unloading the Jeep. My mother has bad legs so is unable to walk on the sand to access the beach any other way, even the boards going to the beach does not help since she still needs to walk quite a distant to find a spot without people around you. I do understand that there are people out there who do not follow the boundary lines, it is these people who are going to end it on the families who look forward to this every year. It is not just the tourism that will be affected from these closures but also the local fisherman who we share the beach with when we vacation. Our vacation is the Outer Banks and I am sure there are a ton of people who go there every year too just because of the convenience of driving on the beach and the fishing. I love not being on top of people at the beach and knowing my kids know how to enjoy a vacation without all the bells and whistles that you have in the Nags Head area. Please take my comment into consideration. I love the OBX and do obey the closures on the beach for the bird and turtle nesting. Just somebody trying to save the beach from being closed to the public and our family vacation.</p> <p>The Kashlak Family Baltimore, MD</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	195	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,09,2010 12:48:48						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Further closings and restrictions will deprive so many of the population the joy and wonders of the outer banks. In these days of economic down turns ,there are few things families can enjoy and afford please don't impair the wonders of nature.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,by my wife and I. Fred L. and Bertie W. Campbell</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	196	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Palmer, Bill						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,09,2010 16:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a 56 year old native of North Carolina I have very deep roots to the Outer Banks, ie: Hatteras Island especially. Although my current residency is in central N.C. much of my family still resides in much of the area that I do visit often. After a way and manner of living for people on the island for some 60-70 years or more, suddenly NEW beach access regulations came about stopping beach recreational activities, especially my favorite fishing, all because of special interest groups with very deep pockets?. in the millions wanting to preserve a bird not even endangered. Although perhaps up for discussion, quite a few have contradictory but, scientific documentations that much of the "special interest groups" evidentiary initial presentation was heavily fabricated in an effort to obtain the desired results. In reality -the special interest group- with very deep pockets seem to outweigh the residents with -not so deep pockets- who was at the time not able to complete satisfactory rebuttal because of such a fabricated presentation not expected by the plaintiff. The Federal Judge bearing witness to the "plaintiffs" very expensive attorney seem to have bit hook, line, and sinker. In effect the restriction as current allows a bird who has survived for years before to suddenly have the run of the land with more rights than any human has ever had.</p> <p>Since, I have witnessed business owners struggle to pay mortgages. Seen restaurants that have closed, resort shops with for sale signs in the window while there competition has already gone out of business. I have seen hotels/motels during peak seasons look like a ghost town while seeing other new arrivals of far away expecting a few days on the beach learning the news, become aggravated and leave quoting : "I'll never be back to this place again". As for myself and family we have visited about 75% less than ever before over the past 3 years. This means local proprietors of restaurants, tackle shops, gift stores, ect. simply do not get our business of the past? some 75% less and that is called a man made disaster. Birds and humans have survived</p>						

0008808

together since the beginning of time. Without going to extreme overboard measures and with simple common sense supervision, we still can and therefore should not close beach access recreations during spring and summer peak times.

In closing let me leave remembering a statement my Dad said many times, whom died on the very beach now under attack while fishing in 2002. Quote: "We are the most supreme educated people of the world but, we everyday are our own self destructing enemy caused from our own stupidity"?. Unquote. Tootie Palmer 1927-2002

---

**Correspondence ID:** 197    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,10,2010 07:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have to believe there is a better solution to environmental concerns than shutting beach access, especially when it affects so many people both in and out of your region. As one who loves OBX and has been a persistent vacationer in the area for over 15 years now, I've always been impressed by the care everyone takes of the beaches...much more so than in other areas along the East Coast that we've visited. It's obvious the people who love OBX take care to preserve the region. I'm sure that care can be translated into positive solutions that do not involve denying folks the beauty and enjoyment of the beaches concerned.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 198    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,10,2010 14:17:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am privileged to be a property owner on Hatteras Island at the Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore. I purchased my property with a view to staying there extensively when I retired because I love the beach and the beauties of nature in this unique environment. I have been privileged to volunteer to watch sea turtle nests. I have reported some sea turtles that have been distressed in the winter and was gratified to see them rescued. With that in mind, I was delighted to see stricter court ordered restrictions on beach driving during nesting season for sea turtles and shore birds. I have witnessed the dramatic increase in these species and of successful hatchings since the court orded restrictions. Furthermore, my experience of beach driving enthusiasts has been that they tend to create a nuisance for those of us trying to quietly enjoy the beach. They create extra litter and air pollution. The deep ruts their vehicles make in the sand are not only hard on the wild life, they are hard on ankles and knees for those of us who to walk along the beach. We are also entitled to access to the beach. Furthermore, during the time my house was on a weekly rental program, I found no difference in rental volume before and after the court ordered beach access restrictions. I have been sorry to see business people bamboozled into thinking that good environmental management is bad for business. Please preserve the beach for the wild life and the tourists it draws to the beach. Please preserve the beach for those of use who have purchased beach property to enjoy the sun, sand, and the beauties of nature. We are the true majority of people who enjoy the Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 199    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,11,2010 08:19:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm in favor of allowing access how it has been since the beginning. Mainly for surf access, as well as fishermen who live their lives based around this. In fact, it would hinder our tourist base...many people love the outer banks for just that reason, driving on the beach is awesome when done responsibly. Lets' keep the banks the banks, how they've always been, it's the character! Nature will be nature

---

**Correspondence ID:** 200    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,11,2010 18:07:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please dont punish all cause of a couple. There are many people that respect the beach and ocean. Please rethink your decision.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,11,2010 18:58:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Although I don't live on the Outer Banks I have been a regular visitor there since 1965. I have read the draft off-road vehicle management Plan and I think that of all the options presented alternative D would be the best compromise, although I also believe that all vehicles should be banned from the beaches except for service vehicles and in emergencies. I realize that driving on the beaches used to be necessary for transporation, but with the increase in population and in the number of visitors, driving on the beaches is dangerous for the habitat and diminishes the ocean and beach experience for all. Vehicles if not completely banned should be allowed only in very restricted areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,12,2010 09:54:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please disregard this test message.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,12,2010 09:55:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please disregard this test message.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 204    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,12,2010 10:02:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please disregard this message. This is a test of Convio Advocacy software, designed to enable constituents to communicate with their representatives. If you have further questions about this message, please email webformtest@convio.com.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 205    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,13,2010 07:02:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would like more information on the "science" used to close off areas of the beach for nesting birds and turtle eggs. I think the Park Service has done a good job in the past sectioning off areas of concern. Thank you. I am very concerned that pedestrians and ORV users are being penalized. I am also concerned that hundreds of animals have been trapped and either relocated or killed to "protect" a few nesting birds. "best science..???" The public has to be more aware of this. I am particularly concerned that free roaming cat tracks are found all over the sea shore.. I am concerned that the economy of the area is being compromised , in the obscure interest of "best science"... I am concerned that the designation of the national seashore areas in Hatteras etc. that are "Recreational" areas , are being targeted by groups and organizations..like Audubon society, Environmental Law groups ,etc. who have no idea about the original intent of the designations. And do not understand what the areas in question are used for. We own a rental cottage in Hatteras, and do not want access to our loved areas being determined by a judge and people who have no stake in or interest in the beach. Please keep the beaches the way they were intended to be used. Do not be influenced by unknowing "scientists" and "environmentalists", who know nothing except the propaganda forced on them. Let the Park Service run the beaches the way they did in the past...not the way they are being forced to at present. The "consent decree" has little to do with "consent" but more to do with coercion..{spell??} Thanks again, Bob Mead, Arlington , Vermont, and Hatteras , NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 206    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,13,2010 10:28:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have traveled to Cape Hatteras for decades and we have aduntant rpesect for all wildlife. Please allow RV access to continue on this national treasure. Never have we, or will we, endanger the wildlife in any way. The National seashore is a treasure for ALL of us to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 207    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sayers, John S  
**Received:** Apr,13,2010 19:47:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have one of the largest breeding populations of western snowy plovers on the Pacific Coast, so I can relate to the struggles out there. One of the compromises here was to designate an area for off road vehicles and the rest is fenced off and protected. If people want to drive on the beach, they should pay a fee which would support the monitoring of shorebird populations and enhancement of habitat for them. Enforcement is a key element as well, as one disgruntled tourist can do a lot of damage in a short amount of time. If people really want the experience, then allow corridors and access points and let them walk the rest. My argument is always for sharing the resources, but we half to acknowledge that the birds have rights too. Please do all that you can to limit destructive vehicle use and protect the environment. We need to save ourselves from ourselves.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 208    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,14,2010 05:23:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a marine biologist by trade and even I consider these proposed closures a little ridiculous. The ability to drive the beach for fishermen is part of what makes the outer banks great. I agree with the idea of ORV licenses, but to close access would be a travesty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 209    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,14,2010 06:05:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We visit Ocracoke twice a year. We love the beauty of the island and do our very best to take good care of it while we are visiting. However, we do enjoy being able to drive down on the beach. It is one of the reasons we go to Ocracoke because it is so charming. Please consider that this is an attraction to Ocracoke. The people that visit Ocracoke love it for its charm and natural environment. We need to be able to enjoy and absorb the environment we visit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 210    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gravely, Harry  
**Received:** Apr,14,2010 06:52:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I have enjoyed coming to Hatteras Island for many years. The primary reason we come to Hatteras is the beach access by ORV. We carry a ton of fishing rods, beach canopies, coolers, grill, and lots of food. If beach access is denied to ORV's, then our prime reason for coming down is gone. Thus we will be relegated to spending all of our vacation money at a water front hotel room at Virginia Beach. Hatteras has such a rich history of beaches that are easily accessible to ORV's that it is a shame to end such a storied tradition. The best fishing spot in the world, in my opinion, is Hatteras Point. I heard that one option is to leave vehicles at the designated parking places by the ramp accesses. When is the last time you have walked from the parking lot to the water's edge in June, July or August? When a decision is reached on beach access by ORV's, I hope that you will take into consideration the flood of bad publicity, the enormous impact to the Island's economy and the loss to future generations of the special times we have all had with our ORV's parked close to the water. If the ban goes into effect, make sure that Park Servive vehicles are included in the ban. Then you will enjoy the experience of having to walk to the beach like everyone else. Be carefull though to not to step on a turtle or piper clover.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 211    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,14,2010 07:42:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the beaches open for driving...it's what makes this place great. The ability to find your own stretch of beach and waves away from others is what keeps me comming back.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 212    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,14,2010 08:52:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I have enjoyed the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for well over 20 years. As I am only 29 now my fondest childhood memories are of the seashore. I now wish to share those same experiences and make the same memories for my children (ages 10, 9, 6, 6, and 2) As a father of a large

family and also an avid angler ORV access is a primary concern for my family and I. Without the use of our vehicle we would not be able to enjoy all of the things the seashore has to offer. Without the use of our vehicle I would not be able to tote 5 small children, beach chairs, fishing gear, sandcastle toys, metal detector, boogie boards, beach towels, coolers and all of the other gear necessary to enjoy a day at the beach. One of the draws of Cape Hatteras are the open beaches, the lack of boardwalks, oceanfront restaurants and other eyesores that have taken over most of the other beach resorts nationwide. Now it seems as though CHNS is being punished for their desire to keep the beaches free from this sort of commercialism.

I fully support resource protection, and as an outdoorsman respect and enjoy nature and would never partake in the destruction of habitat or species native to the land I enjoy. I do feel however that the current plan preferred by the NPS is light on protection of resources and heavy on prevention of recreational use of these beaches. One avid outdoorsman enjoys the natural environment in which they encompass themselves. I am unnerved by the feelings of nature vs. people that special interest groups have caused by forcing such restrictions on the seashore over the last couple of years, never before have the residents and visitors of the seashore ever resented or taken these creatures for granted, and have enjoyed their company and looked out for them ever since the seashore has been inhabited.

From a personal standpoint of that of a father, hoping his children will grow up with the same love of the seashore and memories that I have enjoyed all these years, and as a way of protecting the shorebirds for future generations to enjoy and marvel at I put my support behind the Coalition for Beach Access DEIS Statement. I believe this represents the best options to protect both resources and beach users.

The Coalition for Beach Access DEIS Statement can be found here: <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf>

I appreciate your time in reading this,

Sincerely, Christopher A. Tolliver

---

**Correspondence ID:** 213    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,14,2010 09:23:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If a workable agreement is not agreed upon soon it will cause a sever down turn in the economy for those people living on Hatteras Island , and the entire Outer Banks area! I for one and 5 other families from Jersey will stop coming to the island for our vacations! We know we don't make their economy flourish, but every little lose spells disaster for the good people and friends who live there. We respect all wild life and know we all must do our part to conserve it , and are willing to share the resource with them , so lets not let a few special interest groups spilo it for all. Thank You and may God bless you and you efforts in this matter. Sincerly Gene @ fam.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 214    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tidd, Michele  
**Received:** Apr,14,2010 11:00:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm writing today to request your swift action and fervent support of [ HR-718 /S-1557 ], a bill regarding preservation of public access to the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.  
The National Park Service has for decades done an exceptionally capable job of managing our nation's first National Seashore. A delicate balance exists between insuring and protecting public access and wildlife habitats. Management authority belongs in the hands of NPS. Passage of this bill restores that authority and with it that balance.  
There is no place quite like it yet both its past and future is in peril without your support. The currently imposed Consent Decree is based upon flawed science with no peer review and supported only by well funded special interests and experts without credential. Along with missing its goal entirely it succeeds in polarizing while ignoring balance and excluding the stakeholders. Recreational enjoyment of this rare national treasure and public access to all Americans is being denied. A local economy is being devastated and the historic fabric of a community woven over hundreds of years is threatened at additional expense to taxpayers.  
Recent National Park Service Resource Management Field Summary Reports confirm that the first full season of park management under the Consent Decree has had no measurable positive impact upon wildlife habitat in general, or bird and turtle nesting results specifically.  
The National Park Service has historically been the protector of the National Seashore's natural resources while promoting safety and minimizing conflicts among its various users. I urge you to return management authority of the park to those best qualified. In the interest of fairness and good common sense I ask for your vigorous unqualified support and immediate action.  
Sincerely,  
Michele Tidd

---

**Correspondence ID:** 215    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jones, Eliot  
**Received:** Apr,14,2010 11:16:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an OBX resident, I feel that driving on the beach around Oregon inlet is fun. But if the water quality and wildlife are impacted by this activity I'm fine with giving it up.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** James, Freddy  
**Received:** Apr,14,2010 18:47:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS  
After carefully reviewing your purposed plans for ORV Management on Hatteras Island I strongly disagree with Alternative Plan F in your DEIS. I agree that the resources of the national park need to be protected but I have an issue with the face that Alternative Plan F mainly only addresses the Human interference to the bird nests which as your study states only represents 3% impact. It fails to significantly address the causes for the 83%(54% mammalian predation 29% storm/Lunar tides) of nest failures. In order to protect these nests, the main issues should be more significantly addressed. In order to limit the predation, you are trapping and killing animals that pose threats to the nests. Why not eliminate the habitat for these predators and force them to find other areas away from the beach to live? There is a huge area inland of Cape Point that has slowing over time become restricted to human access thus allowing sand dunes and vegetation to flourish. These dunes and vegetation provide ideal habitat for the very same animals that you are trapping and killing. By flattening the area and allow visitor access solely in the non breeding time November- March you will eliminate places for these predators to live effectively protecting the nests much more effectively. By solely trapping and killing these animals you are not trying to deter any new predators from accessing the area close to the bird nests. By closing these areas off over the years and allowing the dunes and vegetation to flourish the birds have been forced closer and closer to the Surf Zone thus moving closer and closer to danger. By flattening this area you will also be creating possible habitat for these birds to nest which will be further away from the ocean which represents the 29% of failure rates. By encouraging and providing safe habitat further away from the ocean you will not only be protecting the bird nest but also moving them away from the main access points for visitors thus allowing visitors and bird nests to thrive is this wonderful national park. I find it very difficult to understand why your preferred Alternative Plan F does not address any of these points. If you are truly trying to protect the species why not address the main threats to them first? Please read these comments and truly look at the suggestion I and many others have and will continue to make. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a recreation area that has and hopefully will continue to be enjoyed by generations of visitors. Please do not eliminate these accesses when there are better ways to help visitors and nature co-exist in the park.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	217	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,14,2010 21:36:41						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe option A is the best option.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	218	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,15,2010 02:49:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Only emergency vehicles should be allowed on a beach. I think zero tolerance is the way forward.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	219	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,15,2010 07:09:44						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Leave the beaches in North Carolina, and Long Island New York, open to beach driving. In West Hamptonn new York a few years ago a storm blew through the outer beach and washed away some homes. The Army Cor of Engrs rebuilt it and enviornmentalists resisted reconstruction of the original homes due to piping plover nesting. The homes were eventually rebuilt, and the piping plover population has increased substantially. People arent killing the piping plovers.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	220	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,15,2010 07:55:46						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly believe the beaches should be kept open for 4x4 access. This is vital to the OBX. One of the great things about the place and a beautiful way to get some solitude in a unique part of our country. The bird population is not nearly as effected as they want you to believe and the people pushing for 4x4 ban on the beaches are completely unfamiliar with the realities of the situation. They do not utilize beach access and realize how important it is for many people to enjoy their time outdoors.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	221	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,15,2010 09:12:38						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please try to do everything possible to keep the Outer Banks beaches open for driving. The main reason my family and I visit is because we can drive out on the beaches. We enjoy being able to pull up to a spot right there on ocean front to fish, tan, or just enjoy the sound of the waves. It is sooo much more appealing to be able to park at the place you're going to be for the day. Having to carry chairs, towels, coolers, umbrellas, baby items, tackle boxes, fishing rods, etc is extremely cumbersome and being able to drive and park where you are going to be situated makes it that much more enjoyable. If we had to lug all of the aforementioned items out onto the beach from a parking lot, well we just wouldn't go. We drive over 3 hours to visit the Outer Banks and Hatteras area every year for a week stay and then we also visit on numerous weekends. If we were not able to drive on the beaches then we would find somewhere else to visit and I feel like there are many others that feel the same way. The decreased tourism would be detrimental to the local people and businesses as they make their living on tourism. Everyone is always so pleasurable to be around there and always willing to help out. The Outer Banks is a place of enjoyment, peacefulness and relaxation that you can't find many other places. Being able to drive out on the beach is the main contributing factor to the enjoyment of the Outer Banks. Whenever someone thinks of the Outer Banks, they automatically think of driving on the beach and I would hate for this to be taken away from the area. I understand the potential dangers to the wildlife, but most everyone that visits is respectful of the wildlife and their habitats and I do not think they will cause harm to them. Please keep the Outer Banks beaches open for driving, it has a huge effect on so many people. Thank you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	222	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Williams, D						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,15,2010 09:49:50						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please re-open beach driving and keep it that way. I used to make 10-15 weekend trips a year to the outer banks but now I don't feel the need to come the extra miles. Living in Virginia I have the beaches of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina within a few hours drive and before the restrictions would ALWAYS choose the outer banks of North Carolina. Not any more! The beach restrictions have cut that 10-15 trips a year into 2 -4. I now go elsewhere the majority of the time. I feel sorry for the local motel, restaurant/bar and shop owners. They are the ones hurting from the beach closers. I still spend my money it's just in other markets now.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	223	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	S, J M						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,15,2010 10:29:40						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is imperative that these beaches stay open for people to drive on. One of my favorite memories growing up was driving on the sand with my eyes fixed on the ocean, looking for a good spot for a surf. My dad and my brothers would pile in our truck, pack our boards, pack a lunch, and set off. It was like our own mini-adventure in a way, harkening back to the pioneer spirit of early surfers and early Outer Banks residents alike. Do not take away this integral part of the island to placate some overzealous (albeit well-meaning) environmentalists. I think what the Outer Banks stands to lose from shutting down the beaches is too great both culturally and economically. The Wright brothers probably bothered a few animals with their forays down the dunes, but look what their accomplishment has meant to the island, state, and world as a whole. Obviously driving on the beach will not lead to another great leap in human technological advancement, but like the first flight, it represents a trademark of the Outer Banks experience that is too important to be taken away. Thank you, OBX tourist and hopeful future resident						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	224	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,15,2010 11:02:50						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						

**Correspondence:** I am a strong believer in saving the outer banks as a natural wildlife area. I would be appalled to see any further development as far as housing and business. Driving on the beach provides a perfect way to get to a stretch of beach that is not full of people. Finding a serene place is one of the reasons people come to the outer banks. Essentially, closing off these areas to the public would prohibit them from ever seeing the outer banks in their true form. I would be agreeable to a line of demarcation that would not allow vehicles near the dunes, but would allow them closer to the water. Please consider other options such as the one I mentioned. Thank you. Linda Lambert

---

**Correspondence ID:** 225    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,15,2010 11:07:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Large, Inflexible Buffers (page 121-127)  
I disagree with the beach closings due to oversized buffers. Please consider the tax paying fishermen and women by allowing for ORV driveby areas to pass a protected area while still ensuring the recreational value of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.  
Predator Management (page 124-125)  
I disagree with eradication of certain species in order to protect others. God did not plan it that way! The cruel slaughter of foxes and raccoons is unacceptable to me and should be illegal-at the very least-think about it-the government is deciding who should live and who should die!!  
Excessive DEIS Hatch Window Closures Restrict Access(page 125)  
I disagree with the "close it down" approach again. As stated above. ORV corridors should be provided and if this is not possible the nests should be relocated to protect the species very much like the DEIS does on a regular basis for other reasons....(storm, high tide line, etc)  
ALTERNATE F  
The rules, policies and procedures were not reviewed nor approved by the participants within the Reg-Neg process and ALTERNATE F as such should be ruled out entirely!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 226    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,15,2010 11:31:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love going to the OBX. With the access rules that have been in place the last two years I have not been going to the national beaches in the OBX. It is a shame to limit the access to the beach to the ones who are responsible and view themselves as a Sheppard of the ocean. If only the outer banks would follow the same rules that New Jersey created for Island Beach State Park (ISBP) you would see me at your park more often then now.  
By following ISBP you would be creating revenues for the park service to protect, maintain, protect the beaches and habituate all animals. By charging for beach buggies to use the beach you would be able to make sure that the drivers are aware of the park rules and the vehicles are in proper working shape and have the items necessary for driving on the beach. This has all been missing since I started going to the national park in OBX since 1987.  
When applying for a beach buggy permit in New Jersey I learned more about driving on the beach then the previously 15 years that I exclusively went to OBX to drive on the beach. I hope that matters concerning beach access in the park service at OBX get fixed as it has been broken for way too long.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 227    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,15,2010 12:47:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Very simple to the point comment: My family and I vacation every year on Hatteras Island and Ocracoke. If I can not drive on the beach and bring my little dog with me I will vacation elsewhere. Thanks Robert Clark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,15,2010 13:59:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please disregard this message. This is a test of Convio Advocacy software, designed to enable constituents to communicate with their representatives. If you have further questions about this message, please email webformtest@convio.com.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Prigioni, Robert  
**Received:** Apr,15,2010 14:34:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative C seems to preserve the most possible access to the best surfing areas for the most time, while keeping some common sense ideas in place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 230    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cullen, Lawrence D  
**Received:** Apr,15,2010 22:01:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendant Murray,  
Thank you for the opportunity to ask a few questions concerning the Proposed DEIS plan.  
1. In the perusal of the plan I noticed several references to the Buffer zones for the nesting of the piping plovers. The requested circumference of the "Buffer Zones" is stated as 1000 meters. I would like to know what specific scientific findings recommend such distances and the reasoning for 1000 meters as opposed to less, more reasonable,distances. What was the justification for the distance and where else was this distance tested and found most suitable than a lesser amount of buffer.  
2. The rules restricting the presence of any animals was attempted to be stated in the DEIS plan. What are the specific areas noted and for what duration are those restrictions proposed? Does this restriction include the whole seashore including the villages? Does this proposed restriction exclude the villages and only apply to the beach? Are the animals permitted in our vehicles on the beach or only in the villages. Can we transport our animals in our vehicles to and from the villages or on and off the Islands?  
Thank you for your consideration

---

**Correspondence ID:** 231    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 07:05:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the proposed NPS Preferred Alternative F. The restrictions are too aggressive/restrictive and should be reconsidered. I have a real concern in 2 areas.  
Too restrict ORV on the NPS seashore would take away the physically disabled pedestrians their right to access the areas year round. I don't have a

problem with certain time limitations due to endangered species breeding or other key events that would damage their ability to continue their natural existence.

The "Coalition" for the most part are local to the area and would be greatly affected by the restrictions that are proposed by the NPS Alt F. The economic impact would cripple their ability to continue to be a part of such a wonderful natural resource that all should enjoy. These individuals know what's going on in these areas and should be given more of a chance to defend their stand. I doubt that many of those who want this area shut down have ever set foot there.

Please consider my comments.

Thanks, Scott Leonard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 232    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 08:29:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have chosen to comment on a very a contentious issue, The Piping Plover. In addition, I will also comment on the punishment aspect of the Consent Decree.

I am a retired scientist (entomologist) who greatly appreciates nature and respects wildlife. Throughout my entire career I have been concerned with good data concerning many scientific projects. Nowhere in this voluminous document have I seen any concrete data, which incriminates Off Road Vehicles (ORV's) with the decline of Piping Plover (PP) populations on the Outer Banks (OBX) of North Carolina.

The DECIS lists the ebb and flow of PP populations over the years but no concrete data is presented which links population decline with the use of ORV's. Rather, there is incrimination by inference. As mentioned in the DECIS, many factors affect Piping Plover populations such as climate, predators and other natural phenomena. I could not find any concrete data which points to ORV's rather than climate or say predators instigating the decline of PP numbers.

North Carolina is the southern most range of the PP. No PP's were found in South Carolina during the 2008 survey. A clear majority of the population was found in the northern states of Massachusetts (566) and New York (443) while 64 were found in North Carolina. The state of Maine on the other hand is the most northerly range of the PP where 10 were counted in 2008.

This population distribution can be graphed into a bell shaped curve i.e. Normal Distribution graph. Variability exists in every biological population. The greatest variability in the PP population exists at its extremities (North Carolina and Maine). The least variability is found in the states, which harbor the largest numbers (Massachusetts and New York). Statistically speaking, it is very difficult if not impossible to have a high degree of confidence in North Carolina PP numbers used to make important decisions on beach closures.

As a result of my above commentary, I strongly disagree with the National Park Service (NPS) decision to regulate ORV traffic and close beach access based on PP population numbers. I will be one of the first people to applaud ORV beach closures if shown concrete evidence that ORV's are to blame for reducing marine bird populations.

The other issue I would like to comment on concerns the Consent Decree decision of extending beach closures based on vandalism. I was astounded to ascertain that the punishment of extending beach closures is based on absolutely no evidence. If I am not mistaken, North Carolina is in the USA and not China or North Korea. There is an obsession in this country known as "Due Process".

There are radicals on both sides of the fence. Advocates for beach closures may have caused the vandalism (Defenders of Wildlife and/or the National Audubon Society) as well as groups (NCBBA and/or OBPA) opposed to marine bird regulation by the NPS. It is unjust and unfair to arbitrarily punish one group while another group is deemed to be without guilt.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 233    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 09:49:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please disregard this message.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 234    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 10:19:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please disregard this message.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 235    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McCarthy, Justin V  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 10:47:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ladies and Gentlemen,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 236    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 11:07:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern:  
I have been traveling to North Carolina's Outer Banks for the past 20 years, since I was a child with my mother, father, & brother. Now that I am a father, I continue to travel down each year with my family to share this special place with my own family. There are many great surfing breaks along the stretches of beaches that I have enjoyed for sooo long. It would be a travesty to loose this place. I am a father, a surfer, a fisherman, & a waterman. I think that this proposal is outrageous and should be turned down immmediatly. To deny access to the Outerbanks would be unconstitutional. If access is denied, I will never make the trek down to North Carolina again. North Carolina will loose a lot of commerse and business and I guarantee that North Carolina will absolutely not have any of my business ever again!!! Please Vote NO on this issue.  
Sincerely, Chad Broder East Meadow New York

---

**Correspondence ID:** 237    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McCarthy, Justin V  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 11:31:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ladies and Gentlemen,  
While we (Mrs. McCarthy and I) currently reside on Fire Island, NY(within the Fire Island National Seashore, (FINS)) we own property in Waves, NC and a home in Virginia Beach, VA.  
My comment is more general in nature and addresses the tenor of the Draft Environmental Impact Study which, when read objectively, displays a clear bias against ORV use and for environmental concerns real or imagined. Additionally the tenor is somewhat condesending which is typical of documents

0008814

written by bureaucrats. I would expect our US Department of the Interior to require its employees to maintain a more neutral position on issues as sensitive as the "Rights of Individual Americans" to continue to use the Hatteras Island beaches as they have for decades.

My second point is that THE PIPING PLOVER POPULATION IS VERY NEARLY AT THE FEDERALY MANDATED REMOVAL NUMBER OF 500 PAIR OF BIRDS. PIPING PLOVER WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE "THREATENED" LIST IN THE VERY NEAR FUTURE. So the Hatteras Island National Seashore (HINS) folks have developed a plan based on a "Threatened" not "Endangered" species that is about to be removed from the Threatened and Endangered list all together. What kind of sense does that make? OH, Yes they must be MONITORED for an additional five years but that is just that, MONITORED, nothing more. Well as they have done here at FINS they are aware of the PLOVER Issue so they have recently introduced a replacement "Threatened" plant, the Sea Beach Ameranth. Sound Familiar? You bet it is. All in the name of protecting what has been and is the property of the citizens of this great country. What we are seeing is a concerted effort by a small group of bureaucrats to impose their will on the people of this region. I have yet to see the REAL SCIENCE behind any of their recommendations. For Example: WHO says the PLOVER breeding season begins in March as stated in the EIS? Here in NY (Further North) it begins April 30th. How is that when we know the birds migrate from north to south? Why do they use "exlosures" to keep out predators? Why not collect the eggs and incubate them till they fledge? Where is the SCIENCE that says allowing a couple of birds to live naturally is better than having hundreds live via an incubator?

The Environmental EXTREMISTS have won here in NY. You will not like what is about to happen to your rights if this DEIS passes in any of the present forms (A thru F).

Respectfully, LTC & Mrs. Justin V. McCarthy, Jr. USA (Ret.)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 238    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** avallone, michael  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 12:46:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i believe that responsible driving on unpopulated beached in the outer banks is one of its major appeals, especially from users that come from populated, over-governed beaches up north, like in ny and nj.  
i am fortunate to be from east hampton, ny and we are allowed to drive on the beach year round, with limitations on certain beaches during peak season. it works out great and contributes to fishing, surfing, camping, and other activities.  
many people compare east hampton to cape hatteras in that the ocean and the sounds (bay) are so close divided by a strip of sand. it is a major appeal that is remains uncrowded and accessible for most of the year.  
please keep the outer banks appealing...thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 239    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 13:42:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is a test message to confirm that we are able to successfully communicate with your office via your webform. There is no need to log or respond to this message. You can disregard the remaining message, unless you want information about why such test messages are necessary. There is also no need to add the email address associated with this test (webformtest@convio.com) to your office's email lists.

This message has been sent by Convio, one of the leading providers of online advocacy communication services to nonprofit organizations. Our clients include many of the country's largest public interest groups, trade and professional associations, labor unions, higher education institutions and corporations. These groups use our software to publish web pages that enable their supporters to send messages directly to their elected officials. Each message sent by our system has been initiated and authorized by a constituent, always contains the sender's name and home address, and has often been personally edited by the constituent.

Regular testing of webforms is necessary because there are no standardized protocols governing communications with the offices of federal, state or local officials. In contrast with email and fax, webforms allow each office to require different information or steps to successfully transmit a constituent's message to their elected official. Moreover, webforms are often changed without notice, and these changes require us to update the custom connectors we used to communicate with each office. If your elected official is a member of the U.S. House of Representatives or Senate, we have begun working on a project under the auspices of the Congressional Management Foundation to develop best practices and promote a standard communications protocol that will help facilitate your management and processing of digital communications.

We apologize if this test message has caused you any inconvenience. If you have any additional questions or concerns regarding these tests or online constituent communications generally, our Director of Engineering Services, Joseph Poirier, would be happy to speak with you. He can be reached at (512) 652-2665 or at joseph@convio.com.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 240    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 16:47:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** please dont close the beaches i have been going there since i was born thats 14 years now all the good times i had there why close anyway i mean come on one bird extinct wont kill anyone you guys should worrie about important stuff not birds dying people dying i mean come you people care more about birds than yourself and family members.you close the beaches just proved one thing your a bunch of

---

**Correspondence ID:** 241    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,17,2010 01:47:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service,  
I do not understand how TCP information was not included in the DEIS. I spent a little less than an hour on the internet and here is what I found as posted on the nemuseumofhistory.org/nchh/amerindian.  
North Carolina American Indian History Time Line  
Pre-Sixteenth Century American Indian History Time Line- 700-1550 A.D. Many groups of American Indians live in the area now called North Carolina. These include the Chowanoke, Croatan, Hatteras, Moratoc, Secotan, Weapemoc, Machapunga, Pamlico, Coree, Neuse River, Tuscarora, Meherrin, Cherokee, Cape Fear, Catawba, Shakori, Sissipahaw, Sugeree, Waccamaw, Waxhaw, Woccon, Cherawah, Eno, Keyauwee, Occaneechi, Suponi and Tutelo Indians.  
1584  
Sir Walter Raleigh sends explores Phillip Amadas and Arthur Barlowe to North America in search of potential colony sites. At Roanoke Island the explorers meet American Indian Wingina and finds the site excellent for settlement. They return to England with two Indians, Manteo and Wanchese who learn English and are used to create publicity for Raleigh's colony.  
From the accessgeneology.com/native/northcarolina site:  
Hatteras-Meaning unknown. Location-Among the sandbank about Cape Hatteras east of the Pamlico Sound and frequenting Roanoke Island.  
Village-Sandbanks of Cape Hatteras History - Lawson (1860) thought the Hatteras showed traced of white blood ... In 1762 the Rev. Alex Stewart baptized 7 Indians and the mixed blood children of the Attamuskeet, Hatteras and Roanoke tribe.  
Connection in which they have become noted- The possible connection of the Hatteras with the Croatan has been mentioned and their name has become perpetuated in the dangerous cape at the angle of the outer sand islands of their old country.

0008815

It seems to me,if there is historic documentation of the Hatteras Nation noting they lived on the cape of the outer sandbanks, and their blood line mixed with Sir Raleigh's colonists then, many of the people here, on Hatteras Island today, have historic as well as cultural properties in and about them, also. And since Native Americans are perpetuators in keeping their history & culture alive in their present, daily lives you can be sure the culture and history of the people of Hatteras Island perpetuate the same.  
Thank you for your time on this matter.  
A.K.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 242    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mendieta, Vince  
**Received:** Apr,17,2010 02:37:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the plan to close off sections of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to ORV usage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 243    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Weiner, Henry  
**Received:** Apr,17,2010 13:06:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been taking my family to the outer banks for 30 years. It is a wonderful experience of nature made possible in large part, by the ability to drive on the beach. Beach driving can be done responsibly and should be allowed to continue. We need fair balance between reasonable use of the Outer Banks, and protection of its wildlife  
Dr. Henry Weiner, M.D. 610-388-0804

---

**Correspondence ID:** 244    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Carmosky, Leo J  
**Received:** Apr,18,2010 10:18:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern: My family and myself have vacationed on the Outer Banks for the past thirty (30) years. I disagree with the proposal to limit ORV travel at Cape Hatteras National and Recreation Park. My family has always adhered to the regulations that are posted, we value what the Park has to offer we show respect for wildlife and foral growth never to distrub or pick. We have piniced on the beach and fished taking what we bring in back out and depose of properly. As a Vietman era Vet who believes that the Park is for all to enjoy.  
Over the years walking has become difficult for me to walk long distance hense my need to be able to drive on the beach. I feel that the restrictions being placed on the Park will hamper me and my fellow vets the enjoyment of the park by limiting our access to the beach. I am will to work with the Park to come up with a soluation that would benefit all.  
Sincerely your;  
Leo J. Carmosky

---

**Correspondence ID:** 245    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,18,2010 12:01:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I are long time visitors of the Cape Hatteras Seashore and look forward to the peace and serenity we find while visiting the island. I have been visiting since 1980 and return annually for vacation. One of the primary reasons I/we enjoy the island is the ability to access the ORV areas and the benefits that come with that ability. This includes many different areas of Cape Hatteras and Ocracoke. From Waves to Avon, to the point at Buxton, I find that it brings me closer to nature and to the way those beaches were enjoyed decades ago. Growing up in Virginia Beach, I much prefer to quite nature of the ORV areas as opposed to crowded pedestrian access beaches. Myself and my family (of five) included, consider Cape Hatteras to be 'God's Country' and not having easy access to these areas would prohibit my family from enjoying the beauty and serenity of the seashore. I urge you not to prohibit access to the ORV areas during peak summer months. While I agree that we must protect the coastal area including its most precious inhabitants, having a balanced system of education, accountability and enforcement would be the most appropriate method of doing so; promoting the viability of the wildlife protection, using funds collected from permits (short and long term) to maintain the shoreline, and enforcing the adherence to the ORV guidelines.  
Having said that, I absolutely agree with increasing the education of those using the ORV areas, limiting access to those that have completed an educational program and acknowledged their responsibilities in doing so, and having tight oversight of those areas are warranted. Prohibiting access to those areas, on the other hand, are not warranted, nor would they benefit the balance between growth, tourism and respect for this national treasure. I have witnessed careless or perhaps, clueless user's of the ORV areas and understand the damage that such individuals may cause. I also have witnessed caring and concerned user's, such as my family who carefully observe the ORV guidelines and who take pride on doing things like taking the children on a walk with a goal of removing all trash from the areas around our vehicle. Let's work to educate individuals, promote the protection of the inhabitants, self manage the areas, but not limit the area to those who care deeply about them.  
In closing, I would urge you to not prohibit access (other than security/active breeding or nesting areas) but, rather, teach people fo respect and care for them. Initiate children and family programs such as a turtle nesting education walk, 'make better than when you arrived' drives, post signs that will serve to remind and promote this needed balance and work to empower visitors to make the changes that are needed. I should also add that being a spiritual man, the seashore of Cape Hatteras are perhss the most awe ispiring place on this earth for me. I proposed to my wife their, I have introduced my children to the great mother ocean there, and I plan to live my last days there. Please, please, don't take that away from me or any others that share that same passion.  
God bless and good luck in your deliberations.  
Sincerely,  
Jason Wade

---

**Correspondence ID:** 246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,18,2010 14:20:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am pleased that the use of ORV's on Hatteras Island is being evaluated, but find that the concerns of ORV beach users, and environmental concerns seem to be overshadowing those of users who choose not to drive on the beach (pedestrian users).  
This is probably due to the fact that there are dedicated and effective organizations which promote ORV use on beaches and there are also equally effective organizations dedicated to environmental protection. There does not seem to be a similarly effective organization to promote the needs or non-ORV users.  
This could be because pedestrian beach users have an expectation that reasonable beach use does not ordinarily include ORV use. Because of this expectation, the beach users who prefer limited ORV use are not organized in the same manner as pro-ORV groups or environmental groups. Consequently, non-ORV beach users' interests seem to be lowest on the priority list with regard to this issue. In fact, this group could very easily be a majority of users who are unfortunately at this point a silent one. While it may be true that this is a less organized group, that fact does not diminish the

importance of equal enjoyment of the beaches for pedestrian users, especially those which are part of the National Park system.

I am in favor of environmental protection since most of the enjoyment I receive as a beachgoer is from the appreciation of nature. I would argue that is the reason most people use the beach except for commercial users. Also, if there must be beach driving, why do it on barrier islands? These are fairly limited compared to the rest of the Eastern coastline. These are more isolated, and therefore unique habitats.

I realize that there are some users who only enjoy the beach while driving on it. I understand that some surf-fisherman want to drive their gear to the beach in ORV's instead of using other methods. I do not understand why this is being given such legitimacy when ORV drivers are not permitted to drive on most other beaches or in other National Parks except on park roads. I am sure there are many ORV users who would like to drive their vehicles directly to sites within National Parks but are prohibited for many of the same reasons they should be prohibited from driving on the National Parks located on the barrier islands.

If the assumption has been made that ORV use on beaches is an acceptable use then I hope the following issues will be carefully considered.

Pedestrian users spend money at local establishments in much the same way as the group of ORV users.

The only exceptions I can think of are that ORV users may purchase more gas than non-beach drivers, or this population may include more surf fisherman. This category of ORV user is the only one that seemed to have specific consumer needs that may (or may not) vary from the non-ORV beachgoer.

Unlimited ORV use may preclude use by pedestrian users.

In personal terms, my husband and I have traveled from Richmond, VA to the Frisco National Park Campground each year during the summer since approximately 2001. We tried beach-driving with our SUV and found that it did not enhance our experience. In fact it clarified the fact that we choose to visit Hatteras Island specifically to experience the unique natural habitat found there. There are many other beaches closer to Richmond but we go the extra distance to experience what had been in the past a fairly quiet and natural beach. During our many visits we happily spend a considerable amount of money at local establishments. An amount that is surely comparable to what ORV users spend. While our past beach experiences did include some ORV traffic, there was not enough to be so disruptive that it ruined our enjoyment.

This has changed drastically in more recent years, especially in 2009. The beach at Frisco campground was either roped off for environmental reasons to the North or so crowded with ORV users to the South that the beach area was practically unusable by non-ORV beachgoers from the campsite. The beach looked much like an overfilled parking lot. I do not agree that this can be environmentally sound and I know from personal experience that it ruins the enjoyment for pedestrian beach users.

So unfortunately, if this ORV activity continues in the future, we will stop vacationing in Hatteras. It seems to me that if the ORV activity negatively impacts pedestrian human use of the beaches it must surely be negatively impacting wildlife as well, for many similar and not easily quantifiable reasons.

To conclude, here are the points I hope will be considered in the decision-making process:

The concerns of non-ORV beachgoers should not be overlooked since many users of this type will not return if unlimited ORV use is permitted. This will have the ultimate effect of reducing the economic benefit for local businesses from pedestrian users. If pedestrian users do not visit because of ORV use, this offsets the argument that there is overwhelming economic benefit to the area due to ORV use.

In fact, over the long run, more visitors may come if they are assured there is no or limited beach-driving. Local businesses may become more viable in the long run with a broader target market as opposed to the surf-fishing market.

ORV use doesn't need to be prohibited altogether to conserve the enjoyment of non-ORV users, but there must be limits on the number of vehicles on the beach at any given time. Either through the use of permits issued, or monitoring of ramps to limit the number of ORV's allowed to enter.

Policy-makers may not be aware of the tremendous number of vehicles that were actually on the beach in 2009 when options were being considered.

There could be a means for monitoring the actual number of vehicles each year and policy could be structured so that more stringent rules can come into effect if the number of ORV's continues to increase.

Some of the beach area in front of Frisco campground could be reserved for pedestrian use only. This will increase enjoyment for non-ORV users and create a potential buffer area between any areas where ORV use is permitted, and the areas roped off for environmental reasons. Also, since most of the campsite is reserved for tent campers, a group who likely choose to tent-camp to experience nature, it would seem to follow that there are many users from the campsite who will not be using ORV's on the beach.

In addition, there are two pedestrian walkways specifically designed to make the beach accessible to pedestrians only. Why not use this as access to a pedestrian only beach area. There should also be some accommodation for areas limited to non-ORV use only at all times of the year.

The natural habitat must also be conserved in order for there to be continued enjoyment by most beachgoers. Clearly if the ORV's cause humans to leave and not return they are also affecting wildlife in a similar manner.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	247	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,18,2010 14:22:07						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am pleased that the use of ORV's on Hatteras Island is being evaluated, but find that the concerns of ORV beach users, and environmental concerns seem to be overshadowing those of users who choose not to drive on the beach (pedestrian users).</p> <p>This is probably due to the fact that there are dedicated and effective organizations which promote ORV use on beaches and there are also equally effective organizations dedicated to environmental protection. There does not seem to be a similarly effective organization to promote the needs or non-ORV users.</p> <p>This could be because pedestrian beach users have an expectation that reasonable beach use does not ordinarily include ORV use. Because of this expectation, the beach users who prefer limited ORV use are not organized in the same manner as pro-ORV groups or environmental groups. Consequently, non-ORV beach users' interests seem to be lowest on the priority list with regard to this issue. In fact, this group could very easily be a majority of users who are unfortunately at this point a silent one. While it may be true that this is a less organized group, that fact does not diminish the importance of equal enjoyment of the beaches for pedestrian users, especially those which are part of the National Park system.</p> <p>I am in favor of environmental protection since most of the enjoyment I receive as a beachgoer is from the appreciation of nature. I would argue that is the reason most people use the beach except for commercial users. Also, if there must be beach driving, why do it on barrier islands? These are fairly limited compared to the rest of the Eastern coastline. These are more isolated, and therefore unique habitats.</p> <p>I realize that there are some users who only enjoy the beach while driving on it. I understand that some surf-fisherman want to drive their gear to the beach in ORV's instead of using other methods. I do not understand why this is being given such legitimacy when ORV drivers are not permitted to drive on most other beaches or in other National Parks except on park roads. I am sure there are many ORV users who would like to drive their vehicles directly to sites within National Parks but are prohibited for many of the same reasons they should be prohibited from driving on the National Parks located on the barrier islands.</p> <p>If the assumption has been made that ORV use on beaches is an acceptable use then I hope the following issues will be carefully considered.</p> <p>Pedestrian users spend money at local establishments in much the same way as the group of ORV users.</p> <p>The only exceptions I can think of are that ORV users may purchase more gas than non-beach drivers, or this population may include more surf fisherman. This category of ORV user is the only one that seemed to have specific consumer needs that may (or may not) vary from the non-ORV beachgoer.</p> <p>Unlimited ORV use may preclude use by pedestrian users.</p> <p>In personal terms, my husband and I have traveled from Richmond, VA to the Frisco National Park Campground each year during the summer since approximately 2001. We tried beach-driving with our SUV and found that it did not enhance our experience. In fact it clarified the fact that we choose to visit Hatteras Island specifically to experience the unique natural habitat found there. There are many other beaches closer to Richmond but we go the extra distance to experience what had been in the past a fairly quiet and natural beach. During our many visits we happily spend a considerable amount of money at local establishments. An amount that is surely comparable to what ORV users spend. While our past beach experiences did include some ORV traffic, there was not enough to be so disruptive that it ruined our enjoyment.</p>						

This has changed drastically in more recent years, especially in 2009. The beach at Frisco campground was either roped off for environmental reasons to the North or so crowded with ORV users to the South that the beach area was practically unusable by non-ORV beachgoers from the campsite. The beach looked much like an overfilled parking lot. I do not agree that this can be environmentally sound and I know from personal experience that it ruins the enjoyment for pedestrian beach users.

So unfortunately, if this ORV activity continues in the future, we will stop vacationing in Hatteras. It seems to me that if the ORV activity negatively impacts pedestrian human use of the beaches it must surely be negatively impacting wildlife as well, for many similar and not easily quantifiable reasons.

To conclude, here are the points I hope will be considered in the decision-making process:

The concerns of non-ORV beachgoers should not be overlooked since many users of this type will not return if unlimited ORV use is permitted. This will have the ultimate effect of reducing the economic benefit for local businesses from pedestrian users. If pedestrian users do not visit because of ORV use, this offsets the argument that there is overwhelming economic benefit to the area due to ORV use.

In fact, over the long run, more visitors may come if they are assured there is no or limited beach-driving. Local businesses may become more viable in the long run with a broader target market as opposed to the surf-fishing market.

ORV use doesn't need to be prohibited altogether to conserve the enjoyment of non-ORV users, but there must be limits on the number of vehicles on the beach at any given time. Either through the use of permits issued, or monitoring of ramps to limit the number of ORV's allowed to enter.

Policy-makers may not be aware of the tremendous number of vehicles that were actually on the beach in 2009 when options were being considered.

There could be a means for monitoring the actual number of vehicles each year and policy could be structured so that more stringent rules can come into effect if the number of ORV's continues to increase.

Some of the beach area in front of Frisco campground could be reserved for pedestrian use only. This will increase enjoyment for non-ORV users and create a potential buffer area between any areas where ORV use is permitted, and the areas roped off for environmental reasons. Also, since most of the campsite is reserved for tent campers, a group who likely choose to tent-camp to experience nature, it would seem to follow that there are many users from the campsite who will not be using ORV's on the beach.

In addition, there are two pedestrian walkways specifically designed to make the beach accessible to pedestrians only. Why not use this as access to a pedestrian only beach area. There should also be some accommodation for areas limited to non-ORV use only at all times of the year.

The natural habitat must also be conserved in order for there to be continued enjoyment by most beachgoers. Clearly if the ORV's cause humans to leave and not return they are also affecting wildlife in a similar manner.

**Correspondence ID:** 248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** parenti, william r

**Received:** Apr.19.2010 11:01:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** comment addresses deis

when you, us gov't, makes your final decision, i strongly want you to use "common sense" for this very important document. the result of what you do will affect the "quality of life" of thousands of people for many years to come. PUT YOURSELF IN OUR POSITION. ....WE THE PEOPLE or we the plover.....

**Correspondence ID:** 249    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Benson, John O

**Received:** Apr.19.2010 12:12:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

First I would like to say that I believe that Alternative A, which would resume management of the Seashore beaches as they were managed under the "interim plan", is most preferable of the alternatives provided in the DEIS. This alternative provides both an adequate amount of resource protection and maintains a good visitor experience. Other alternatives provided in the DEIS provide neither effective resource protection nor sufficient visitor experience. Each actually detracts from visitor experience while providing no actual benefit to the resources they attempt to protect. My reading of the NPS preferred Alternative found it to be the most restrictive set of regulations ever promulgated in a National Seashore. I also see it as creating major impairments to visitor experience while having negligible benefits to resources. This is not the alternative produced by the "advisory committee", assuming that the "advisory committee" is the Negotiated Rule Making Committee. That committee did not produce a recommendation and for the NPS to claim that their preferred alternative came from that process is totally ingenuous. Re: the need for additional pedestrian only areas within the Seashore. I do not believe these additional areas are necessary. The beaches of Pea Island must be counted as pedestrian only areas within the Seashore. While NPS and USFWS employees might see a distinction between the beaches of Pea Island and the rest of the National Seashore, the visiting public does not. Even excluding Pea Island from consideration, there is presently more than adequate pedestrian only access to the beaches. Those areas in front of the villages provide 24 hour vehicle free areas during the tourist season. Outside of tourist season, the Seashore beaches see very little ORV use. I have lived on Hatteras Island full-time for the past 10 years and have never had trouble finding deserted beaches for walking, jogging, or driving. This is even true during tourist season, if one merely goes on the beaches in the early morning. I also see no justification at all for having differing seasonal beach closures in front of east-facing villages and south-facing villages. Those closures should be as stated for Rodanthe, Waves, Salvo, and Avon and should apply to all village beaches. The NPS preferred alternative provides for closures due to birds that are grossly excessive. First, all such closures should provide pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses during the entire breeding and nesting season. Second, the buffers themselves should be much smaller. I recommend that PPL buffers be no more than 50 meters for nesting birds and 200 meters for unfledged chicks. The NPS preferred alternative provides for closures due to turtles that are also grossly excessive. There should be no night-time restrictions of driving or of beach fires. There is no evidence that such use of the Seashore beaches effects turtle populations in any manner. Restriction of beach access during night time hours will not preclude the need for law enforcement coverage. It will not increase law enforcement's ability to address problems during daylight hours because there never has been, nor is there now, night time coverage that can be shifted to daylight hours. Finding an on-duty NPS law enforcement ranger within the Seashore after 11pm is something that happens very infrequently. Extremely limited and inadequate law enforcement coverage has existed within the Seashore for many years. The solution is to hire more rangers. One of the Seashore's primary visitor activities, fishing for red drum and striped bass, is best done during hours of darkness. Many visitors come to the Seashore primarily to enjoy a beach fire. These activities should not be restricted without definite proof they significantly reduce turtle usage of the Seashore beaches. Turtle closures provided for in the NPS preferred alternative are much too large. All turtle closures should provide for pedestrian and ORV passage at all hours of the day and night. During the "hatch window" passage should be provided at all hours, either between the nest and the dune line or in front of the nest with NPS volunteers overseeing the nest to insure that vehicle passage will not interfere with hatching turtles. The restrictions placed on pets in the Seashore under the NPS preferred Alternative are excessively restrictive. I see no justification in "prohibiting pets in the Seashore during breeding season including in front of the villages" as is stated in that Alternative. Pets should be restricted from SMA's, but not from other areas of the Seashore. I found the Socio-Economic analysis as presented in the DEIS to be flawed. First, I do not believe that the NPS visitor counts are anywhere near accurate. These counts have been taken in a haphazard manner, with extremely inaccurate measuring devices, and have been compiled and assessed by people who have no concern for the validity of the numbers they are presented. Secondly, I believe that the economic impact by any of the Alternatives on the villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands is much greater than their effect upon the whole of Dare and Hyde counties. Any analysis that includes data from areas outside of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands is flawed. As one example only, the economy of Nags Head is affected much less by regulations imposed on Hatteras Island than is the economy of Buxton. An interesting analogy would be to look at the feelings towards NPS employees generated by NPS actions in regards to beach closures by the residents of Buxton and the residents of Nags Head. I believe that there is a similar difference in economic impact between the two areas. The NPS has obviously noted this difference in feelings as evidenced by actions they have recently taken in the Buxton area to shield their employees from the perceived animosity. ORV permits should not be required unless they are readily and easily accessible to all visitors. Present NPS staffing and facilities are inadequate to handle an ORV permit requirement. Any cost for these permits should be negligible, no more than \$10.00 for an annual permit. Any educational component should be no more than receipt of NPS brochure along with the permit.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	250	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,19,2010 13:23:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't close the beaches. That's the main reason we go there. Those ruggedly beautiful beaches have been the backdrop to our family vacations for the last 35 years. My parents always took us to Avon for a week every summer and I can tell you honestly, we looked forward to it all year long. Now I have a daughter of my own and although she was only 1 1/2 this past summer on her first trip, she LOVED it. I wish I could share with you the video of her first time on the beach. We drove out the afternoon that we got there. She loved bouncing through the sand and through the dunes. By mid-week she started shouting "pirate!" every time we drove out. Although it was very windy that first day, you could still hear her squeals of delight and her laughter over the wind and the crashing waves on the video camera. We need to be able to drive out to take the little ones and all the gear that goes along with them. Maybe if more people were available to patrol the beaches, there wouldn't be any problems that would prevent the rest of us from being smart and respectful of this place we love so much. You could create new jobs, how could that be bad these days? I just think of all the perfect places out there on the point that we could never get to if the beaches were closed. Those tidal pools and sand bars and shallows are PERFECT for families with little ones and for the grandparents as well. If we can't get to the beach, why would anyone come to visit?						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	251	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Williams, Mary C						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.19.2010 13:31:26						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am hoping that the beaches remain open to vehicles. It drives the local economy for tourists to simply "drive" on the beach. That is a large part of my motivation for visiting the Outer Banks and I am a loyal and repeat visitor. Thanks for your consideration.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	252	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.19.2010 13:55:38						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My husband and I have been visiting Cape Hatteras beaches for our annual weekly vacation for the past 35 years -- always careful to protect any wildlife we may encounter, always careful to leave no trace, always in awe of this inspiring location. There is a unique freedom that one experiences on the beaches of Cape Hatteras (a freedom that is simultaneously intertwined with nature, history and a restoration of one's soul). To deny responsible citizens that freedom is to deny us our "pursuit of happiness". We expect our elected officials to protect OUR rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Please ensure access to Cape Hatteras beaches for all responsible citizens and for future generations!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	253	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,19,2010 18:13:01						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like people to be able to drive on the beaches of the outer banks if possible. If not I hope people will be allowed access to the park via boardwalks, bike trails, etc. I am a surfer and can say the waves there are some of the best on the east coast of the united states, possibly the best. It would be a disappointment if surfers were not allowed to surf there, as that is the story for many of the best breaks on the east coast. Hopefully, a solution will be found that doesn't impact the environment while still allowing people to access this beautiful, surreal place.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	254	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Wheless, Karen S						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.19.2010 18:17:20						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I'm appalled with the possibility that our North Carolina beaches are going to be governed by "environmental" policy that will deny access and recreation to the public. We have similar problems in other parts of our country with restrictions initiated by people who haven't a clue about reality yet are part of organizations that can spend without restriction and file lawsuits that force issues to be resolved that don't exist.</p> <p>I am writing to you today because my family enjoys recreation in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. My father enjoyed those same beaches (and even rode with his fishing buddies in a plane right onto the beach in the 1950s/60s) and his father before him. I support H.R. 718, which would reinstate the National Park Service's Interim Management Strategy, pending the issuance of a long-term management plan, for America's first National Seashore, on the Outer Banks of North Carolina.</p> <p>Currently the area is in the wake of a consent decree that restricts public access to prime locations in many parts of this recreational area. The consent decree is the result of a lawsuit, filed by a few environmental groups, against the National Park Service challenging their management of the area. People throughout America have a tradition of traveling to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for family activities. These include fishing, surfing, swimming, bird watching, beachcombing, kiteboarding, horseback riding and many others. These activities have been disrupted by the consent decree and local businesses have been hurt in the process. If H.R. 718 is enacted, the management of the area would revert back to the National Park Service, which historically has proven to be effective in protecting resources, instead of a court imposed consent decree.</p> <p>I ask that you preserve access to Cape Hatteras, one of America's most beautifully enjoyed beaches, for responsible family recreational activities as it was intended when the Federal Government created it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Karen W. Louisburg, NC</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	255	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Dowling, Dana D						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,19,2010 19:46:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am writing to express my views that as many as possible public beach access points at the Outer Banks remain available for visitors and residents to enjoy. Being the owner of a commercial real estate firm, I have had quite my fill of eminent domain issues where the government tries to take property from owners - this attempt, disguised as a charitable motivation to safe wildlife, is a misguided attempt by liberal-minded leftwings, most of whom don't even live in our state, much less at the North Carolina coast!</p> <p>My family and I enjoyed a wonderful week at Nags Head and we saw plenty of areas, along with others in North Carolina throughout the state, dedicated to wildlife preservation. In this day and time, given present economic difficulties, to burden the local taxpayers by infringing on their ability to earn a living is a travesty. Enough already of the activists posing as "do-gooders" - send the interlopers home!</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	256	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,20,2010 09:27:58						

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been traveling to the OBX with my family for over 40 years. While I live much closer to Ocean City , MD, i am not at all attracted to it's busy commercialized shore. I love the natural beauty of the beaches protected by the National Seashore. It is ridiculous to close beaches to public use. It is possible for piping plovers to survive and thrive with humans making use of beaches too. Please don't allow this natural resource to be taken away from those who love it.

**Correspondence ID:** 257    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Guffey, Carolyn  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 11:08:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a concerned citizen, born and raised in North Carolina, I am deeply concerned about the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan (DEIS). The results of this study will have profound effects on the residents of Ocracoke as well as the thousands of tourists who visit the island each year. For centuries man and fowl and sea creatures have co-existed on this island, why the urgency now to adapt a plan so prohibitive? Please consider the repercussions of your decisions and how they will affect everyone, man and fowl. A healthy balance has existed, so far, and with proper insight the island can remain accessible for generations to come. I urge you to use well meaning, environmentally sound, logical reasons coupled with considerations of equitable access to our natural resources when deciding the size of buffers and corridors for off-road vehicles. Please, please be fair.

**Correspondence ID:** 258    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Midgett, Timothy W  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 14:46:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The purpose of my comments is to express my profound disbelief that our country can/will allow such an atrocity to go forward given the gravity of the impacts upon the livelihoods on the Outer Banks. The beach access issue as relates to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area amounts to nothing more than a "taking" of rights granted to the public when the park came into being. The US government made promises to the good folks of the Outer Banks when the park was established and the original naming of the park explicitly set forth the intended future use thereof. Over the years, the National Park Service has largely ignored their custodian obligations as the keepers of the Seashore Recreational area due to an apparent lack of adequate funding. Of even greater consequence is that the NPS apparently didn't bother to follow it's own internal policy and have repeatedly failed to meet federal mandates for planning and intended use purposes. Furthermore, the efforts to restrict access are being driven by off-island, over-zealous environmentalists who have very limited, if any, practical science to back up their claims. These liberal idealists have no real stakehold in the issue being addressed and have proven to be less than forthright in their approach. The facts are not even a consideration for them and just might tend to undermine their case. Hence, they rely upon stuffed shirts abusing stuffed coffers to get their points across. Unknowing contributors send serious money to these environmental organizations thinking of the 'good' they create with their tax-free donations. I will speak for the citizens of Cape Hatteras in stating that positively no good has come from these contributions. I strongly encourage the agencies involved to reach accord and re-open access to the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, re-name the Park as was originally set forth and restore the rights of those whose lives depend upon the beaches being open to the public. Historically, these same beaches have been the life blood of the economy on Hatteras Island. The beaches have been used to carry on the island traditions of commercial and recreational fishing. The fine folks of Hatteras Island deserve the rights they were guaranteed during the creation of the park and have enjoyed for generations. The NPS should perform their custodial responsibilities and ensure unrestricted access just as soon as practical. This is not an issue for the courts to decide - that has proven to be both an economic and catastrophic disaster already. Anyone playing judge and jury in matters such as this should be tarred and feathered for intervention into a democratic right of freedom established by none other than our great democracy, the United States of America.

**Correspondence ID:** 259    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** VanOver, Christine  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 15:11:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in North Carolina and vacation at Hatteras Island 3-4 times per year. It is a special place that needs to be preserved. I agree that as a nation we have a responsibility to protect animals that live and breed within our borders. But we also must ask ourselves, when does a bird's life become more important than a persons? People have been living and working on Hatteras Island for generations. Most of these residents are dependent on tourism for their livings. I, for one, and I know that a significant number of vacationers would not visit Hatteras as much if beach driving were prohibited. Getting to the beach at Hatteras requires a long walk through deep, loose sand to reach the shore. There is no way a disabled person could make the walk. So by restricting the availability of driving, you are also restricting the availability of disabled persons to enjoy the national park that their tax dollars are helping pay for. I don't agree with closing Hatteras to all vehicle traffic, I think that it would do more harm than good. I do think that education and money can help the birds and turtles. Why not close the parts of the beach to traffic where the nests are, and for the rest of the beach, implement a beach driving permit system? Charge for the priveledge of driving on the beach. I would have no issue with having to take an online or at the park service class with test and pay a significant fee to obtain a yearly driving permit. The permit fees can pay for the program. You can also levy heavy fines on those who are caught driving on the beach without one. You will get a more educated public, less driving as some people will opt to walk in as opposed to paying and raise additional funds to pay to find and protect more nests. With the state of the American economy, the park service could use additional income and the residents of Hatteras need to keep what little they have.

**Correspondence ID:** 260    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nieto, Sharon  
**Received:** Mar,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to comment on the off-road vehicle management plan. Our family vacations on the Outer Banks every summer. We live in Virginia Beach and are used to loud crowded beaches. We oppose all beach driving on the outer banks. I'm sorry if the fishermen can't drive right up to the fish. Vehicles should stay on roads.

**Correspondence ID:** 261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Blevins, Danny  
**Received:** Mar,22,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To my beloved Hatteras Island:  
I will always cherish the many memories we have so dearly enjoyed together. Do you remember the time when I was a child and my grandparents introduced me and my brothers to you? It was love at first sight. The countless mornings watching the sunrise over your beautiful waters while fishing, and learning life lessons spoken to me by my grandparents. Lessons on respect for you and your abundant wildlife. Learning to drive on your golden sands with care and caution. Oh that was so many years ago. My how time fly's.  
I recall countless times when my friends along with my family and I would drive your sands to clean you up. We would load our vehicles with washed up storm debris or scattered litter left behind by non-respecting walk over tourist. We did this out of love and respect for you and your wildlife and enjoyed every minute of it.

How about the time you hosted a beautiful wedding for your dear friends Mike and Donna, only later you so graciously did it again for their son Josh. Let us not forget the gorgeous sunset that prevailed while Scott and Lynn were exchanging their vows. My you are quite a lady. I remember surfing your water and meeting a beautiful lady walking your pristine sands. That lady is now my best friend my love and not to mention my wife. I recall brgining my new born son to you and watching him smile as we stuck his tiny feet in your sand. He is now grown and would someday love to introduce his children to you.

I have met the most awesome friends in my life on your shores. These friends and I all ahve the same love interest and that love is for you my sweet Hatteras Island. You have so touched our lives that thanks would not even be sufficient. you are our refuge our peace and our sanctuary. When life's troubles seem to drag us down, you my dear show us the beautiful creations of our all mighty God. Peace and serenity seem to over take us. You have no idea how much you mean to countless people. Millions who love and respect you.

Please I beg of you don't leave us for the un-informed unappreciative and selfish organizations such as the Audubon Society or the so called Defenders of Wildlife. You know as well as I do that this would only mean that your shoreline would be left cluttered with debris and trash by those that may walk your sands, those that do not respect you and enjoy the many things we have shared together.

Our hearts right now are very weary knowing the fate that may lie ahead for you. If those that don't know or even VISIT you have their own selfish agendas placed on you.

I plead with you our National Park Service or any government agency that has deemed themselves as decision makers for what you may think is best for our beautiful Hatteras Island. THINK before you decide to take away a place that our most Glorious God has created for all. Created not only for birds and animals of all types, but also created for humans those that God created in his own image.

Hatteras has long been a wildlife santuary and respectfully so. But it is also a santuary for people. People who respect and appreciate all of what Hatteras Island has to offer. Please do not take our access to these beautiful shores away.

**Correspondence ID:** 262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Miller, James

**Received:** Apr,12,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** As a long time visitor to the Buxton/Hatteras area for purposes of vacationing and fishing I would like to encourage the N.P.S. to take visitors who drive vehicles onto the beach into account when drafting the DEIS. I personall have been driving vehicles on these beaches for 28 years and have not once seen an instance where harm was don to the beaches or environment by vehicles being driven on the beaches. In fact, the people gaining access to the beaches via 4 wheel drive vehicles are concerned to the extreme for the well being of the beaches, and creatures that frequent these beaches. The environmentalist would have the public believe otherwise, that the visitors to the beaches cause harm to the environment. if this is the case, why have I never seen this happen in all the years I have driven the beaches of the OBX? Where is the scientific proof that such damage is being done? Bottom line - there is plenty of room on the OBX beaches for visitors in vehicles to coexist with the environment with no harm being done to the environment. To close these beaches to vehicle traffic, for no reason other than pressure being brought to bear by environmental groups, would be a gross injustice to the American public.

**Correspondence ID:** 263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Paxson, Robert and Rossana

**Received:** Apr,12,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to ask you to please consider my comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a very special place where man and nature have been able to coexist for many years. Its natural beauty and beach access have drawn many of us there and we in turn have supported the local economy, gladly. We've enjoyed beach access for surfing, fishing, and just being on the beautiful place that the CHNS is. We've made many friends from other states there along with business owners whom we also consider friends. The friendly ladies of The Outer Banks Motel, Tides Restaurant, Orange Blossom Bakery, Diamond Shoals Restaurant, Bubba's BBQ, Red Drum Bait&Tackle and host of others. We haven't been down there in a few years, but what is happening there now with beach access saddens me so I felt compelled to write to you. Please consider the impact the beach closures have had on the local businesses. We all love nature and we've been patiently waiting for the Piping Plover issue to be resolved. However, it appears that the real problems facing the Plover are not trucks driving on the beach, but predation and studies have shown that predation actually decreases with beach access. The Plover situation affects us here in New Jersey as well. The efforts made to protect Plovers over the last 15 years have produced no marked increase in their population compared to their numbers when beach access was unrestricted. In that sense, I think the measures taken have done more harm to people than good for the Plover. When you all decide what it is you are going to do down there concerning beach access please understand that it will most likely set a precedent that will have repercussions all over all coastal communities of the United States. We're all watching and hoping. We don't envy you and the position you are in and wish you all the best in what happens on The Cape Hatteras National Seashore and the beach access issue.

**Correspondence ID:** 264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Paxson, Robert S

**Received:** Apr,20,2010 15:59:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with any action prohibiting or restricting vehicular access on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. It goes against the very reason the Cape Hatteras National Seashore was created. And the negative economic impact to the people who live there has been horrible.

**Correspondence ID:** 265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** McCabe, Kevin

**Received:** Apr,14,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Mike,

I am writing today to express my thoughts and observations with hopes they will be taken in consideration for the new Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore management plan. I have reviewed the 700 plus pages of the ORV management plan and environmental impact statement. What I did not see deep in the pages was very disappointing. Cape Point needs to be represented with more respect in regards to human activities! The Cape Point area has been a very large part of this Nation's maritime history and this island's cultural. Well over 1200 shipwrecks over have been recorded in the immedieate area and countless lives and dreams have been lost at Cape POint. There is also a longstanding heritage of commercial and recreational fishing that has fed families and this nation for centuries. It has been a social gathering place of people for many generations including the Native Americans from long ago. Cape Point is a Mecca for surf fishing, birding, shelling, windsurfing, surfing, sunbathing, and many other recreational activities. These are facts. I understand too that it is the southern most breeding area for a very limited number of piping plovers and other shorebirds when the conditions are just right. The National Park has done a decent job helping these species. But neither you nor I are responsible for their fluxuating numbers. There are several major factors that cause these bird's survival numbers to go up and down. Storms and predation are by far, and with no argument, the two biggest factors. The Park's own data shows it is not from visitors walking or running over nests or chicks! The bird enclosures in the Cape Point area are

necessary and I have personally always endorsed them. However, I spent the last two months reviewing piping plover nest hatchings at Cape Point. Over an eight-year period, all the data I reviewed showed that every chick hatched in an enclosure has traveled west towards the salt pond or lateral dune, never east towards the north beach or ocean! I know my birds and their activities very well after observing them for over 40 years. Perhaps that is why I'm presently working with Duke Energy studying avian patterns in the Pamlico Sound for the proposed wind energy project. Please look at that data very closely when making final decisions at Cape Point. There is no reason access to Cape Point should be denied when the area is being monitored by so many qualified Park biologists and the enclosures are properly in place. The special interests groups that created the latest outrageous buffers did this with little or no scientific justification and most intelligent people question their true motives. I would also like to know what Audubon, SELC, and DOW have done to help my National Park increase shore bird numbers. Local and national organizations have multiple beach clean ups. Has Audubon? How about DOW? Have they created new habitat anywhere? Have they increased education to help shorebird species? Donated any money to local groups like N.E.S.T.S? They have done absolutely nothing! Their influence should be very limited when the final plan is drawn up. They are going to sue again regardless of what plan is implicated.

In closing Mike, please keep this in mind. If the American people knew the truth and what the hell was really going on out here, I would not be writing this letter. Remember what just happened in New Jersey, Virginia, and Massachusetts elections...and don't forget Toyota's bad karma after giving Audubon 20 million dollars. The good people of the United States are tired of being pushed and bullied around. This Park certainly needed some changes but it should never resemble a full-blown bird refuge or be managed by a few special interest groups with big money lobbyists. You were doing a fine job way before they ever got involved. There's a very large majority of people that are behind you and I don't hear anyone screaming "I want my National Park close" ...do you? Do not confuse other areas of the Park like the inlets and spits with Cape Point. The Point is a very special place and needs the full respect and access it deserves. Please listen to the majority and thanks for all your time invested in my National Park's future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 266    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** NORRELL, BILLY E  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 16:54:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** All options presented in the report are too restrictive. In fact, the preferred option (F) of the NPS and the establishment of SMA's will severely adversely impact the economic survivability of the 7 villages within the national seashore.  
As a long-time resident of Hatteras Island I strongly oppose any incorporation of the options as presented in the DEIS Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 267    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 17:43:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There needs to be some more "flexible" language put to this bill.  
It is a very unique landscape and is used by many different folks. To just close the areas is not the solution.  
There must be some compromise

---

**Correspondence ID:** 268    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sanderson, Jaime L  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 17:50:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been visiting Ocracoke Island yearly for the past 44 years. Over the past several years, the beach closing to the South Point has decreased our desire to come to the island. It is the only calm water for our smaller children. We have come each year as a large extended family of over 75 people renting many cottages and staying for 1 to 2 weeks. These closures for birds that are not endangered species is not acceptable. These closures are going to greatly hurt the economy of Ocracoke. My family is trying to decide if we should change to a new location. I can guarantee if my family, that are devoted to Ocracoke, are considering not going anymore, many others are as well. We love Ocracoke because it is so peaceful and we have complete respect for the beaches, but nonendangered birds shouldn't be a priority.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 269    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lail, Donna c  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 18:15:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern, I don't see the need to have the beach access on Ocracoke island closed off due to the bird nesting. The Island is unique in itself. We have been going to Ocracoke for 25 years just to be able to enjoy the access to the beaches. We have always been able to drive out to the South End of the Island to catch and release our state fish. Those who visit the island also respect the birds. Please do not cut off the rights to our ability to drive on the only 7 miles access. Thanks for your help in this matter. If there is the need for me to do more to stop this from going into effect please feel free to contact me on this matter. Donna Lail!!!!!! I am Against this new proposal!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 270    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cromer, Richard G  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 18:54:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have been coming to Ocracoke twice a year in the spring and fall for the past 13 years we are real big animal lovers and we don't mind that the ends on the beach are closed off due to nesting but, we think that someone should mark off a channel for the people that like to fish to through. We spend a lot of money to get down there twice a year and it really isn't fair that we get down there and then can't get to good spots to fish.  
Thanks, Ricky & Trish Cromer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 271    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 05:40:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In regards to DEIS draft Alternative F. I understand protecting the wild life, but you also have to consider the people that come to Ocracoke to fish and enjoy the beaches with their families (including pets). Too many times I have seen something that my family enjoys taken away because some environmentalist is ticked off. Last year was our first year vacationing at Ocracoke and we scrimped and saved this year so we could come back. We enjoyed the unregulated, un-commercialized, family feel of the town and the ability to drive our SUV down to the beach. With 2 small children, it was way easier to drag all their toys, chairs, etc. down in the truck. I understand keeping the wildlife protected, but don't eliminate what little use we have on Ocracoke...at this point you may as well close the town down. Has anyone done an economic impact as to what this "proposed" act will do to the town? If this goes through - you will lose us as vacationers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 272    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,21,2010 07:14:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Fully support management plans to protect seashore wildlife no matter how beach driving/ORV use is affected.

**Correspondence ID:** 273 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ellis, Janet C  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 09:31:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our beaches and way of life on the Outer Banks. I totally support the coalition for Beach Access position statement on the DEIS.

**Correspondence ID:** 274 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ellis, Janet C  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our beaches and way of life on the Outer Banks. Our organization totally supports the coalition for Beach Access position statement on the DEIS.

**Correspondence ID:** 275 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ellis, Samuel S  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 09:34:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with the Coalition for Beach Access position statement on the DEIS.

**Correspondence ID:** 276 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 10:18:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that it is awful that the beaches may be closed because of birds and turtles. I love animals, but when they start running our governments and dictating when beaches should be closed. They do not pay taxes! These beaches keep the economy going in Hatteras. Without people on the beach there will be no need for hotels, restaurants, etc. We the people support the Island of Hatteras. Our family travels to Hatteras 3 times a year. When the beaches start closing we will find another place to vacation, but will the residents of Hatteras be able to find another place to live and make a living? Good question. Maybe the environmentalists should try collecting the eggs off of the beach and putting them in a SAFE habitat to hatch. The odds of them hatching on land is not very good anyway with nature the way it is. Hope this sheds some more light on the subject. DON'T CLOSE THE BEACHES!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

**Correspondence ID:** 277 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rynas, Stephen  
**Received:** Mar,12,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** We received your consistency determination on march 10, 2010 for the proposed implementation of Alternative "F" as the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, Dare and Hyde Counties, North Carolina. The project has been distributed to State agencies that would have a regulatory interest in the proposed activity for review and comment. The public review period will close on April 9, 2010. Please be aware that as we continue to review this submission that we may request additional information. We intend to make a decision regarding whether the propose activity would be consistent with the State's coastal program soon after.  
The State of North Carolina has sixty (60) days from the receipt of the consistency determination to either "concur" or "object" to your consistency determination unless an extension is agreed to. The sixtieth day is May 9, 2010. Furthermore, the State is entitled to an extension of up to fifteen (15) days if additional review time is necessary. Final Federal agency action cannot be taken sooner than ninety (90) days from the State's receipt of the consistency determination unless State concurrence is obtained. Please feel free to contact me at 252-808-2808 if you have any questions. Thank you for your consideration of the North Carolina Coastal Management Program.

**Correspondence ID:** 278 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jordan, Lynn  
**Received:** Mar,13,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I just finished reading the six plans the NPS has recommended for ORV driving on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. All six plans kill the economy on these islands. I see absolutely NO evidence of compromise with the officials of Dare County! And nowhere have I read anything that convinces me that any of your plans were based on substantial scientific evidence! You are recommending closing our beaches for birds who are not even in danger of extinction and killing other wildlife to protect them! What the scientific evidence shows is that ALL wildlife and humans have coexisted beautifully on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands since the beginning of time! Your recommendations represent the most despicable miscarriage of justice I have ever encountered! These plans are simply plans for government control at the expense of the people who pay park service salaries and expenses! It's a devastating mockery of justice and totally disregards the voice and rights of the people!  
Please, help us preserve the economical well being of two islands, totally dependent on tourism to exist. Leave yourself open to a compromise that will keep our beaches open during the tourist season. The citizens on Hatteras and Ocracoke love nature and want to work with the park service to preserve wildlife, but your options do not take the people into consideration! I beg you to reconsider your recommendation to close our access ramps during the summer. It appears obvious that the NSP does not want to work with the citizens to preserve wildlife. Please prove me wrong!

**Correspondence ID:** 279 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sandbeck, Peter  
**Received:** Apr,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for your letter of March 4, 2010, concerning the above project.  
We have conducted a review of the project and are aware of no historic resources which would be affected by the project. Therefore, we have no comment on the project as proposed.  
The above comments are made pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's Regulations for Compliance with Section 106 codified as 36 CFR Part 800.  
Thank you for your cooperation and consideration. If you have questions concerning the above comment, please contact Renee Gledhill-Early, environmental review coordinator, at 919-807-6579. In all future communication concerning this project, please cite the above-referenced tracking number.

**Correspondence ID:** 280 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 14:56:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In regards to the DEIS section on "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages" page 136. I disagree with this item wholeheartedly and feel that it is far to restrictive and that current regulations are sufficient to protect both birds and other wildlife. Current regulations allowing pets on a 6 foot leash year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORV's are fair and the rare infractions are dealt with in such a manner as to strongly discourage future disobedience. Please do not completely prohibit us from sharing the beauty of the seashore with our four legged friends.  
Thank you for your time.

**Correspondence ID:** 281 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 15:10:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been a property owner in Nags Head since 1996. One of the main reasons I own property in this area is the sheer joy I get from accessing the entire National Seashore area for surfing and for being able to utilize access to the ramps for fishing and beach enjoyment, without the crowds. I, and my family (and I would venture to say all property owners) have always been very respectful of the land, the wildlife and the ocean. There is nothing I cherish more than surfing north of S-Turns at sunrise, mostly by myself. It is pretty close to an inspirational experience. I am sure many can identify with this sentiment.  
Although, as an attorney, I understand that there are some who mistreat the beauty of the area. When I see it, I address it. Those persons should be prosecuted. Perhaps there is a need for more Park Rangers to enforce the existing laws or to take another look at the laws and to draft some that have some more teeth. But, for those who want to go to extreme measures to take access away from the majority of the locals and a nation of travelers, surfers, fishermen, and beachgoers, who respect the nature of the land, is to perpetuate, what, in my opinion, is the problem in this country at this time. Punishing those who should not be punished, because of a minute percentage of wrongdoers and the environmental(in this case) opportunists who will use and exploit a situation to further their cause.  
I am not saying that there are not measures that can be taken to try to accommodate all interests, and wildlife is very important to me. I, as have most surfers, probably have spent more mornings with honu (turtles) in Hawaii and dolphin on the Outer Banks than most of the population, but there are surely less extreme measures that could be implemented to resolve the problem. Although I consider myself an environmentalist, as I spend time in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans most of the year, I do not agree that you can stop every problem that arises or protect every animal or species that the EPA determines is endangered. That is just a ludicrous and impossible thing to achieve. Taken to its logical conclusion, IT WILL NEVER BE POSSIBLE. MAN CANNOT CONTROL NATURE OR THE ENVIRONMENT OR THE LAWS OF NATURE. There will always be hurricanes, earthquakes, warming periods and cooling periods. Species will survive and not survive, including human beings. Accidents and nature happens, no matter how much money or regulation you implement. The problem is that certain groups think they can control nature. We have to be respectful of the land, but we have to live on the land. I am concerned that this is another example of the use of extreme measures to take control of another large area of land to advantage the extreme agendas of the politically correct.  
And more importantly, who is going to foot the bill for the loss of use and revenue and cost to the local community? The environmental people are pushing this to save yet another species that they have elevated to status above any human being, and specifically, of the local people who have the use of the area for food, enjoyment or their livelihood? They repeatedly want to create a perceived environmental emergency and then move on to the next, leaving the local population to deal with the cost of saving their cause. Let them fund the loss of use. If this was private property, it would be called a taking without just compensation, a breach of the 5th Amendment.  
Please do not make a decision that will take away any rightful use of the land by the people of this community and of this country. That land and access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore belongs to all Americans, not the EPA, not the turtles, and not the government.

**Correspondence ID:** 282 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Saunders, Ronald & Cecile  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 16:18:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having interacted with wildlife for most of my 65 years, a few things stand out in my mind. Many species have come, gone and returned. Populations have varied over time. Some have evolved in varying ways and many have adapted to numerous and constant changes. God's creatures do this. I have observed that many species, particularly birds, though some are not prone to become intimately friendly, consider us to be good neighbors with close cohabitation and activity as an advantage and contributing to their security and well being. I believe most folks, with thought, would say the same thing. We are not the predator, we do not influence the weather and storm pattern, nor are we eliminating their habitat which have to be their primary concerns. We are of a nature that we want to help birds of the Seashore to thrive. There is no reason not to. I will not address the Turtles, though they too are of special concern to us, as it would basically result in duplication. I'm sure you understand. I will not overlook the fact that there are a few who are not good stewards of the seashore or God's creatures. They are rare and need to be dealt with as in other areas of our society. This can be done and we will help. But, don't punish the good because of the acts of a few bad. At this point, you are probably asking, What do these people want? We want you to look past the "Science" and "Lawyers" and "Decrees" and "Special Interest Groups". We want you to realize WE are not the enemy. We want to continue to enjoy the traditions of Hatteras and pass them on to our children and grandchildren. And yes, we want them to enjoy the beauty of all the birds and other wildlife while they are swimming, fishing, surfing or just playing in the sand. There is no better way to do this than driving to your favorite place at Cape Hatteras Seashore. It is the greatest recreational area we know of. In closing, we would like to say we realize closures are necessary but, there should be consideration as to the size and type of closures, keeping them as small as practical and only up as long as actually needed. This should be a judgement call by Superintendent Murray. Not environmentalists or other special interest groups. We want to trust Mr. Murray. We don't trust the others. We believe Mr. Murry has the knowledge to decide this and the common sense to administer it effectively in everyones best interest. We have to have someone we can count on where this is concerned. I think if the birds could tell us, they would say "we want you close, don't go anywhere, just don't mess with the nest, please".  
That's the way we see it.  
Thank you, Ron & Cecile Saunders

**Correspondence ID:** 283 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 16:19:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it concersed, I have been a visiter of the Outer Banks for over 30 years and have enjoyed off road vehicle riding on the beach. I practice beach respect and care very much for the beaches and its wild life. I have also participated in many trash pick-up events, from the wash up from the ocean and sound. I would like to continue enjoying the beaches along the outer banks with my family and friends for outings and weeks that we plan for the years to come...It would be a great dissapointment to have this taken away from us. Please let us no if their is anything we need to do to have this place stay as it always has been. We would hate to see this change :( Sanford Miles Boutchyard Lynda Hazelwood Boutchyard

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	284	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,21,2010 17:45:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe the restrictions on pedestrian access and dogs is exceptionally severe. I own property in Avon. The economic damage to property value and business will be enormous. The attraction to the beach is its accessibility. One can not saves a resource by hiding and restricting it. One saves a resource by sharing it among all.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	285	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	McFarland, Doug						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,22,2010 07:31:52						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Much of this plan seems like overkill. There is such a small part of Ocaraoke that is developed and I fear that these restrictions would hurt tourism. Requiring dogs be leashed is fine, but banning them is too much. I feel like the restrictions put on the rest of the island are sufficient for maintaining the natural beauty that draws many of us there. Don't go too far! I can't speak to the fishing restrictions as I do not fish, but the hatching buffer seems extreme as well. And the enforcement would require much effort. I think a public awareness program would do just as well given the respect that the vast majority of visitors and residents have for this beautiful and important piece of land and history. Perhaps that should be the first step and then come in with a more restrictive plan if the results are not satisfactory. Thank you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	286	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,22,2010 08:00:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I don't really have much to say except that drastically restricting or shutting people out of some of the most beautiful natural areas in the world is wrong. Many of the people and sportsmen you're shutting out are the true naturalists and conversationalists on this planet and are responsible for preserving much of what we still have. The saddest part is that these people won't be able to pass on the respect they have for these natural areas and over time if this is done the children of today and/or tomorrow will resent being excluded and may reverse everything being attempted here with drastic and with unintended consequences.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	287	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Gallo, Thomas S						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,22,2010 08:03:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a retired entomologist who loves to surf fish and respects wildlife/Nature. I have been concerned with technical data during my entire career. After reading the DEIS (Draft Environmental Impact Statement) for ORV management on the OBX, I couldn't find any statistical technical data which incriminates ORV's with the reduction of marine bird species, in particular the Piping Plover. The OBX is the southern most range of the Piping Plover. Their numbers here, therefore, are very small (64 counted in 2008) compared with New York and New Jersey where their populations are in the 300-500 birds counted in 2008. Piping Plover populations on the OBX are impacted by climate (storms and over-wash) and predators (raccoons, fox, feral cats, raptors, gulls, etc., etc) just as much or more so than ORV's. Where is the climate and predator DATA????????????? Rather than go into a long discourse on statistics, I invite the National Park Service, Audubon Society and Defenders of Wildlife to check any reputable technical publication concerned with providing important answers to important questions. All these publications rely on statistics to provide UNBIASED answers. Nowhere in the DEIS could I find any statistics on migratory birds or turtles. The reason being .....statistics require large numbers to work with in order to provide important reliable answers and these large numbers simply do not exist especially for Piping Plovers. How can any rational person look at a small number of Piping Plovers (64) and conclude that ORV's are responsible for the low numbers without using statistics. The decision to close beach access to ORV's without using statistics is unforgivable and dishonest.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	288	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Singer, Allen M						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,22,2010 08:38:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There must be a balance between NATURE and PUBLIC ACCESS. While Piping Plovers must be preserved, and reproduction assured, a 1000 yard buffer is excessive, and prevents the public from viewing this wonder. I believe 50 yards is sufficient, and allows viewing with the aid of binoculars. While my opinion is hardly scientific, it should be noted that the proposed 1000 yard buffer is 10 times larger that what NPS has established in other areas, and reproduction has been unaffected in these areas! Likewise, the National Seashore allows wonderful fishing access. This is traditionally by 4WD. A prohibition on ORV's would prevent public access to a facility that is maintained by taxpayers. It is the fishermen that Observe, Report, and Voluntarily clean this facility. Perhaps this would be a better definition of "ORV?" There is an old conundrum that asks: "If a tree falls in the forest, and nobody is there to hear it, does it actually make a sound?" What good is preserving the National Seashore, if we (the public) never get to see it? NPS must strike a balance between ACCESS and PRESERVATION. Because BOTH are equally important! The current proposal doesn't attempt any semblance of "balance" and must be modified. Thank you for allowing me to commentm .....						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	289	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,22,2010 10:57:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir or Madam, I have been a member of the North Carolina Beach Buggy Association for 15 years. Over that time,I have witnessed the NCBBA (and other organizations involving recreational vehicles on the North Carolina seashore) act as concerned members. Protecting (NOT destroying) our precious coastline in regard to vegetation,animal life, man made pollution, and erosion is all of great concern to us. I have never met or witnessed a fellow member treat our pristine shores with disregard or neglect, in fact, we are a strong force in policing the coastline to educate visitors and locals to take care of the beauty that surrounds them. By removing access to responsible groups and organizations from recreational passage on the beaches with vehicles, I believe it will further the decline of a watchful eye on our natural resources and increase irresponsible behavior. North Carolina's National Seashore is unique by including passage on our beaches by way of personal vehicle and a tremendous impact on our states economic well being. If beach access is diminished; wildlife, environment, tourism, and livelihoods will be threatened. I am strongly against any legislation that would prohibit using our beaches for responsible vehicle recreation. Sincerely, Kevin A. Caulfield NCBBA Member #8214 Director of Hospitality, Murphy Family Ventures 406 E. Freemont St. Burgaw, NC 28425-5128						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	290	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 12:40:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 291    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 The abuse of this Seashore has been a black eye for the National Park Service, an agency that has responsibility for some of our most treasured landscapes. I support this more balanced approach, and I frequently travel to the Outer Banks as my niece and her husband own a restaurant there. This kind of approach is good for the huge tourist business there and for the other uses of the Seashore. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 292    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 13:41:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 293    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 294    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 295    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 296    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 14:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
North Carolina needs to invest more in "eco tourism". Keeping the ORVs off the beaches will assist in promoting wildlife, which will in turn, promote ecotourism.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are VERY important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 297    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 14:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 298    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 14:11:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 299    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:11:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 300    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:11:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 301    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:11:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 302    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:11:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Wildlife should be thriving so tourists can see and enjoy their presence. Sometimes that means keeping tourists and other beach users away--during hatching times for example. Helping them "come back" is essential.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 303    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Warfel, William J  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:19:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Murray, I am writing to voice my opinion and concern about the Park Service's plan for off the road vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This is a very environmentally sensitive area, and should be treated as such. Any use of the area must be consistent with the protection of this region's wildlife and natural resources. Only alternative D provides adequate protection for birds, sea turtles, and other wildlife that depend on this environment for the the long term survival of their species. I am a frequent visitor, and I value beaches without off the road vehicles. Not only do they disturb the wildlife and the environment, they are very disturbing to thousands of other visitors just like me. Please protect our natural resources and wildlife by choosing alternative D. Thank you for taking the time to read and consider my comments. Sincerely, William J. Warfel Fayetteville

---

**Correspondence ID:** 304    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Holz, Robert F  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:40:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why Oh Why must Government position papers all be so very long? No reply needed.  
I have actually read (most) of the proposed changes to ORV use on the North Carolina Outer Banks.  
For the record, I am really upset that the Audobon Society will not let me use their web site to reply if I disagree with their preferred alternative -- D. I prefer to see ALternative F used to guide these and follow-on actions.  
While F is more resource intensive -- it may call for increasing budget line items and/or staff to satisfy the increased monitoring requirements I view F as the best of all possible worlds.  
As a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks --- I live on the Inner Banks in the town of Belhaven which is adjacent to the intra-coastal waterway -- I am neither an "off roader" nor do I intend to become one. I am in favor of providing as much protection to the fragile environment of the outer banks as is possible while at the same time not closing off other venues for use of this environment (i.e., ORV).  
Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this critical piece of environmental legislation.  
Dr. Bob Holz Belhaven, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 305    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
North Carolina's beaches need to be protected and expanded as natural areas for all to enjoy -- including birds and sea turtles.  
According to a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service study, birdwatchers contributed with 36 billion USD to the US economy 2006, and one fifth (20%) of all Americans are identified as birdwatchers -- there is significant economic potential being lost by not enabling good bird habitats.  
The alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. \* Put Natural Resources First. \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 306    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:41:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. No one plan will fit everyone, so we need to compromise and give all the space needed for the wildlife that very often can not fight back and wild life at the beach is just as important as the sand for it to retain it's natural beauty for every one to enjoy.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:41:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:41:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:41:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 310    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** reed, thomas j  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 14:46:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i do not agree with the DEIS as presented. i believe it does not offer adequate options for the general population to enjoy the Cape Hatteras National Seashore in the way it was originally intended. i do agree with the Coalition to Preserve Beach Access position statement with regard to the CHNS. i believe the DEIS is too restrictive. respectfully submitted, thomas reed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 311    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 15:11:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 312    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 15:11:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 313    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 15:11:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 15:11:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 15:11:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
For years, there were lots of birds, and few ORVs. Today, sadly the situation is reversed.  
We have visited & fished on CHNS often, and are quite amenable to restricting vehicular traffic. The rights of nature lovers & the birds are as important as the ORV owners. The future of the park's animal visitors & pedestrians should take priority over noisy, damaging machines.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
As a person who loves wildlife and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I am very interested in protecting both. I could write a long letter explaining why protection is so important, but I'm taking care of my two elderly parents, one with cancer and the other with Alzheimer's. So please help me by reading the following form letter and letting it speak for me. Thank you. Ruth Stambaugh  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 318    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 15:11:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 319    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 15:11:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 320    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 15:11:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 321    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 15:41:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 15:41:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 323    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 16:11:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

As a native of North Carolina, I can attest that we need to do everything we can to keep the remaining pristine beaches pristine.

**Correspondence ID:** 324    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 16:11:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 325    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 16:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 16:41:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 18:11:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 18:11:37**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 329    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** Apr,22,2010 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

I have been visiting the Outer Banks and Cape Hatteras for nearly sixty years and I love this extraordinary natural resource. I am vitally interested in preserving this for the creatures who have inhabited it far longer than we humans.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

A fair and balanced solution to use of this beautiful but fragile should be achieved. We owe it to future generations as well as to the compromised wildlife who need the area for survival.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 330    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** Apr,22,2010 18:41:40**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 331    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.22,2010 18:41:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

We enjoy Cape Hatteras and have been there numerous times. What we don't enjoy is having big trucks driving all over the beach. let them bring their fishing tackle in on bicycles like the folks do at Huntington Beach State Park in South Carolina. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 332    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.22,2010 18:41:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 333    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.22,2010 18:41:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 334    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 18:41:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 335    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 18:41:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 336    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 19:11:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 337    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Knaack, Kevin T  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 19:26:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let me say first that my family and I are 100% against this proposed further restriction of our RIGHT to cary on the traditions of traditional ORV use with in the Cape Hatteras National Recreational use area. Our forefathers did not gift some of the land now composing the park to have our rights to use it taken away from us. If you pass this legislation you are all but ruining a way of life created long before anyone on either side of this issue was even born. Furthermore as a home owner in Waves, NC you are further destroying our homes values as if the housing economy wasn't depressed enough. My wife and I both grew up enjoying the access to sea shore and sounds via ORV. We respect, clean, and enjoy the life style of ORV use that is the culture of the OBX. We beg of you to do what is right and maintain a way of life that includes ORV use and access to some of the most beautiful beaches in the world. I am purposefully keeping this short in hopes that it will be read in full and used to brief those individuals that have much of our future in their hands. Our home in Waves will be completely worthless with out the value brought by the ORV access. Our hopes and dreams of continuing the traditions of beach activities will end with out your support to maintain access. PLEASE look out for the small business owners and home owners who will be greatly effected by this outcome. Enforce the laws we have, don't add to them.  
The Knaack Family  
Kevin, Molly, and Zane

---

**Correspondence ID:** 338    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 19:41:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more oppportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I am an enthusiastic birder, and have visited Cape Hatteras National Seashore a number of times in pursuit of my hobby. Restriction of ORV use on the National Seashore is important for the preservation of critical habitat for nesting birds.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 339    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 19:41:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more oppportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. Such a practice will increase needed critical habitat for rare birds and reptiles.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 340    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.22,2010 19:41:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 341    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.22,2010 20:11:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 342    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.22,2010 20:11:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 343    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.22,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

We will never "get ahead" if we keep going backwards!

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 344    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 20:11:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 345    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 20:11:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 346    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 20:11:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 347    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 20:11:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 348    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 20:11:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
A small child was narrowly missed by a truck going down the Emerald Isle beach, in front of our cottage at 7211 Ocean Drive, last Fall. I yelled at top of my lungs as ran down the beach stairs from our cottage to try to ward off the approaching truck. The child, was scrambling out of a beach hole a group of children had dug - and did not see the truck. The truck missed him by a few inches, AND KEPT GOING on down the beach - not even stopping. I could not record the license to report the incident to officials, as ran to the child. I did report the horrific happening to the Emerald Isle Realty, begging their leadership to take active steps to end vehicle use on all Outer Banks beaches, all throughout the year. Folks think beaches aren't used in "off season"???? Wake up! A crime to these sixty-nine year old eyes.  
Why is the beach allowed to BE a highway???? in the middle of the sand? Unbelievable. I was raised on the Cape Cod shores and a vehicle on the beach was/is unheard of !! What, for fishing?? Folks can't use the public piers? And at Emerald Isle there are PUBLIC walkways to the beach from the road every so many feet (about three city blocks).  
There is no excuse for EVER allowing a car or truck on a beach. None.  
Mrs. Carol Bower Johnson Dr. Burt P. Johnson, husband.

**Correspondence ID:** 349    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 20:11:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 350    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 20:11:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 351    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 20:41:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 352    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 20:41:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 353    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.22,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

All members of the public should be able to use The Cape Hatteras National Seashore, not just those who drive ORVs. I have driven on the beach while fishing, but a balance can be struck between my interests and those of others. The overriding objective should be minimizing the impacts to the wildlife that uses the beach and dunes so that sustainable populations are maintained. Alternative D is the best of the alternatives, and it is the one that should be adopted.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 354    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.22,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

There are PLENTY of other places where ORVs & SUVs & dune buggys can be used. Please keep them OUT OF THE OUTER BANKS!!!

Americans, generally, are overweight & 'out of shape'. Let them walk. It will do them good & protect the beaches, sand dunes & fragile vegetation too.

I've been to the Outer Banks numerous times. I can well attest that the area can be thoroughly enjoyed without the 'aid' of ORVs.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 355    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.22,2010 21:41:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 356    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 22:11:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 22:41:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 02:42:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 359    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 04:42:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 360    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 05:12:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 361    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 05:12:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife.  
I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors at Cape Hatteras that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 362    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 05:42:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 363    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 05:42:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 06:12:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
We need to do this for the future and for our grandchildren and future childrens children and the earth.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 365    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 06:12:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 366    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** saylor, nigel  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 06:25:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think restricting beach driving is so crucial to the biodiversity of the beach ecology. The rest of the outer banks is a highway. Why trample all over the beach. The thing that should be done is try to make areas more accessible on foot. The Surfrider foundation doesn't want offshore drilling which is good, but they think it's imperative that we not block 4 wheel drive access to areas that might provide potential surf spots. To me that is contradicting considering how dirty automobiles are and the fact that you burn so much more fuel in bigger 4 wheel drive vehicles. The Surfrider foundation is misrepresenting the environment with their double standard philosophy. Please protect the ecology it's imperative to having clean beaches where wildlife can do the thing they have been doing since before we came to these barrier islands!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 367    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 06:42:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 368    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 06:42:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 369    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 07:42:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 370    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 08:12:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 371    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 08:12:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 372    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 08:12:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 373    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 08:42:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 08:42:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 08:42:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 09:12:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 377    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 09:12:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 378    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 09:12:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 379    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 09:42:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 380    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 09:42:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 381    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 09:42:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 382    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.23,2010 09:42:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 383    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

I am president of the Cape Fear Audubon Society. Like Hatteras, our area (New Hanover, Pender and Brunswick counties) has seen explosive growth in beach use and subsequent declines in numbers of successfully nesting shorebirds. National Seashore is important for public recreation but this recreation must be compatible with protection of birds, turtles and other endangered, threatened or declining species. ORV-use is only one small part of public use. Where it is allowed, for instance at the Fort Fisher State Recreation Area, pedestrians cannot safely use the beach. The area becomes off-limit to them. It then looks as though all recreational use is ORV use simply because all other use is excluded. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife.

I would like the final plan to include:T

\*Equal access for all visitors whether they are on foot with binoculars and cameras, families with little kids in tow, or recreational fishermen. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. Thus, a small percentage of users would dominate 75% of the National Seashore. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors and allow wildlife to regain the ground lost by the previous years of poor management.

\* Primary emphasis on protecting natural resources. All recreational use should be consistent with this goal. Despite the ORV uproar, this is readily achievable and would not result in less public use, only in better managed public use. The preferred plan does not allow for adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife, including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Decisions regarding size and location of protected areas should be based on science, not politics.

\* Establish and meet clear goals for wildlife recovery. Park management needs to have a plan to undo the years of mismanagement that have resulted in precipitous declines in wildlife. The plan should be based on the best available, independent science and include clear and measurable goals. If these goals are not met, the plan needs to be periodically adjusted to meet them.

Thank you for allowing public comment. Our chapter regularly visits Hatteras on birdwatching field trips. This is a resource for the whole country. Beaches lined with people and crisscrossed with tire tracks are available for public use all over the east coast. National Seashore should be where people can go to observe wildlife while enjoying beachcombing, sun bathing, swimming, birdwatching, photography and all other activities compatible with wildlife habitat. Please do not allow the noise and political clout of the ORV industry to obscure the fact that it is just one use among many and that it is

the only use that by its nature precludes all the others.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 10:36:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The "preferred" option F on the DEIS is completely unacceptable. It is even more restrictive for both pedestrian and ORV access to the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore. The distances of beaches closed for mating and or nesting birds are much too large. Why does a bird need an area the size of a battleship to breed and nest? This plan is not fair to all users of the park because it not only limits access to the seashore for ORV usage but also pedestrians. Limiting access by ORV is discrimination against those not physically able to reach most of the remote location for recreation. NPS: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." page 210. No piping plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations.  
NPS: "Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users." (page vi) Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents? In 10 years, only 1 minor incident involving a stuck vehicle and a pedestrian was disclosed. The drive was not blamed by those involved, nor was he charged. page(268).  
NPS: "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." page 1 Pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment. Why will Special Use permits to allow the transportation of disabled visitor to the village beaches require the vehicle to be returned to the street, creating hardships and risks in the event of emergencies? page 58  
Excessive DEIS hatch window closures RESTRICT ACCESS- NPS: Around the clock closure from nest to surf line(p.125) Pro-access: Closure to surf line from 1 hour before sunset until dawn, monitored by turtle nest watch team. NPS: 105 meters wide(p.125) Pro-access: Closure should be 10 meters square during the day NPS: Use U shaped light filter fence to orient hatchlings Pro-access: Use Pea Island style keyhole pattern fence to the surf line at night.  
Night driving restrictions penalize pedestrian and ORV users(p.125) May 1-November 15th  
The DEIS describes ORV access as historical in nature(p.83) and also both predating the Seashore and as being integral to the public use by both residents and visitors. The document also illustrates and captions historical commercial fishing(p.18), historical recreational fishing(pgs.15,260) and historical general recreational activities(p.259). These same activities are featured on the cover. The surf zone has long been not just a location for traditional economic activities such as surf dory seine net fishing but also other cultural activities. These include general beach recreation activities, social gatherings, weddings, funerals and hook and line recreational/subsistence fishing. Collectively these activities are components of an unbroken pattern of land use that extend back many generations before the establishment of the Seashore and remain integral to the fabric of the historically unique Outer Banks communities. With that stated: Why has the NPS failed to appropriately address the traditional cultural value of surf zone access? The NPS failure stands in direct violation of its legal responsibility under Section 106 of the NEPA and the NEPA framework as a whole.  
As for the Socioeconomic data and analyses in the DEIS(pg 270-281) it leads to misleading and sometimes erroneous conclusions. Critical weaknesses in the analyses pertain to: 1) statistical definition of the Region of Influence(ROI); 2) incomplete visitation/business survey data (p.566); 3) erroneous recreational user data; 4) inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use; 5) flawed key assumption concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F. These flaws are directly manifested in both the Effected Environment and Socioeconomic Impact sections of the DEIS. Region of Influence(ROI)- The ROI incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV and access issues relating to the Seashore. Inclusion of Northern Beaches in analysis greatly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages. Economic analysis in the DEIS do not use data from the first full year of the Consent Decree (2009). Many visitors were either unaware of the scope of the Consent Decree beach closures, or had already made plans/reservations. Actual business survey data rather than model projections for economic impact for Seashore Villages businesses are not available in the DEIS.  
Alternative F may be the preferred by NPS but it is surely not the best alternative for users of the seashore. In fact all of the alternatives have far too much access restriction for both ORV and pedestrian usage. If I had to choose one it would be Alternative A, which at least take elements of the 1978 draft interim ORV management plan. NPS should seriously consider the irreparable damage implementing such a restrictive plan as Alternative F will do to the surrounding villages and to visitors to the park itself. This is a unique place, the first National Seashore Recreational Area in the United States. Let's not lose that important word Recreational Area, lest we lose sight of the founding legislation for this wonderful place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 10:43:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I personally consider this a life or death situation, certainly not for human beings, but clearly for the nesting birds and sea turtles. There are many places where off-road vehicles can be used. Sadly, there are all too few places left for wildlife fighting to survive human intervention. Alternative Plan D would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, both of which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 10:43:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.23,2010 11:06:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Per page 468 of the DEIS regarding restrictive management areas the use of ML1 is recommended which prohibits any pedestrian or ORV access during the entire breeding season. It seems to me that at least an allowance of a corridor around the enclosed areas should be permitted at and through the high tide line. We are well aware of where the closures are as one cannot possibly miss the unsightly signage and believe it or not, we do not care anything about disrupting the birds and their breeding habitat. All I want is to be able to get my family to the beach and to be able to catch our dinner from the ocean once in a while. And our friends and family that visits each year certainly will not be visiting if we are unable to get to these beaches. My friends and family spend hundreds of dollars per each visit. The alone are bringing thousands of dollars to the area. We have driven and walked around these closures for years now without disruption to the birds. Thank you for reading this comment. Pam Donahue

---

**Correspondence ID:** 388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Clapp, Lewis

**Received:** Apr.23,2010 11:14:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I visit Hatteras Island twice a year for fishing. I do not own property on the island, nor am I involved in any business on the island. When we fish, we are always very aware of our responsibility to protect the resources of the area. We enjoy the total experience which includes observing all of the wildlife of the island, even the rabbits around the light house.

I realize that it may not be possible to have maximum access at all times and protect the wildlife resources. It may also not be possible to give the wildlife maximum protection and have any access. Somewhere in the middle is a compromise that will allow both protection and access. In my opinion, closing beaches and forcing more fishermen onto less and less area is not a good answer.

It may be to late for this idea, but I would like to see an education program for all who use the Seashore. If we are all aware of the needs of the wildlife, we can all work together to make sure that both access for people and protection for wildlife are available.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Burlew, William S

**Received:** Apr.23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my grave concern over the Cape Hatteras Off Road Vehicle Negotiated Rulemaking and Management Plan EIS. I understand there is a proposal to close Hatteras inlet and other areas to Off road vehicle (ORV) use year round. As the operator of a beach house rental unit very close to Hatteras inlet and Ocracoke island at 58213 Sand Road, Hatteras, NC this would have a potentially devastating affect on my rental cottage business as many of my weekly renters are surf fisherman who require ORV access to get to the inlet and good fishing areas.

I have been operating my beach house rental for many years as an investment and my house has provided income to many local handymen, cleaners, and other small businesses. However, if this proposal is adopted I fear I will have to sell my investment (likely at a loss) due to lack of rental income generated from those who wish to safely fish while using their ORV's on the beach. I implore you to reject the ORV driving restrictions and will also be contacting my local congressman to share my outrage at your proposed action.

In addition, on a personal note, my disabled mother would not be able to enjoy the inlet as she cannot walk the many miles to the end of the inlet. I beleive you may further limit access for those disabled who are unable to reach more secluded areas of the beach without the use of ORV's.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration

Sincerely,  
William Burlew Owner Flying Cloud located at 58213 Sand Road Hatteras, NC 27943  
Mailing address 8217 Treebrooke Lane Alexandria, VA 22308

---

**Correspondence ID:** 390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** CONLEY, PATRICIA  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 11:50:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I AM UP SET WITH STUDIES INVOLVED.. WHERE IS THE PROOF THAT CLOSING THE BEACHES HAS IMPROVED THE NESTING OF THE BIRD CONCERNED.. THE TIDES ARE THE REAL DANGER TO NESTING HABIT. NOT PEOPLE.. AND IS NOT, PEA ISLAND AND PORTSMITH ISLAND and other islands, WILDLIFE HABITS NOT A NATIONAL PARK FOR PEOPLE TO ENJOY.. WHAT ABOUT THE PEOPLE WHO GAVE THEIR LAND TO THE PARK FOR OTHERS TO ENJOY..IS THIS A SLAP IN THE FACE.. WHAT ABOUT OLD FOLKS WHO CAN NOT WALK TO THE BEACH.. THIS MEANS THEY GIVE UP THEIR FREEDOM TO FISH BECAUSE IT TO FAR..JUST MY THOUGHTS, I AM GOING THROUGH CANCER TREATMENTS THE ONLY WAY I CAN ENJOY THE BEACH IS TO DRIVE OUT, AND LOOK AT THE OCEAN. ITS A REAL JOY TO MY HEART..I DO NOT WANT TO GIVE UP..AND I SHOULD NOT HAVE TO WHAT ABOUT ALL THE OTHER PEOPLE WHO ARE DISABLED???? WHO NOT ONLY ENJOY THE PLEASURE OF LIVING HERE BUT VISITING ARE THEY GIONG TO BE BANDED... ALL THIS FOR A COUPLE OF BIRDS IS INSANE. PATRICIA CONLEY

**Correspondence ID:** 392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 12:13:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 12:31:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I come to Hatteras, to drive on the beach to access special spots and explore. This is an important activity for my family. We stay at local hotes and bed and breakfasts, dine out at the restaurants and go fishing. If we can't drive on the beach, I think we will go to Mass.

**Correspondence ID:** 394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 12:32:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 395    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 13:02:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 396    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 13:32:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 397    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 14:02:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 398    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 14:02:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 14:03:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
As an avid birder and nature lover, the Outer Banks has been one of my favorite places to visit. One of its special assets is the possibility of seeing endangered species such as Least Terns, and Piping Plovers. ORV's take a heavy toll on these fragile birds as well as the precious and declining sea turtles. ORV enthusiasts are not the ONLY people who want to enjoy the beach. There are those of us who want to enjoy the wildlife and those of us who want to just enjoy the beach without the risk of being run down by an ORV. Surely a compromise can be reached.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 401    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:04:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 402    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:04:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 403    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:04:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 404    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:04:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:32:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:33:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 407    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:33:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:33:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:33:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 14:33:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello, Thank you for the opportunity to comment. After reviewing the DEIS, the best choice appears to be option C--it seems to provide the best combination of environmental protection and beach access without additional expenses of options D, E, or F--those options involve building additional ramps, parking, etc., in addition to the probability of increased management expenses. Thank you, Jeff Schuyler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 15:03:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 15:03:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 15:03:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 15:15:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family travels to Cape Hatteras every year for our summer vacation. One of the main reasons we travel there is due to the ability to drive on the beach. If the beach were to be closed due to environmental reasons that are more extreme than anywhere else on the east coast, 1000m closures for a plover nest which is ten times larger than the required space in Cape Cod, we would not travel to Hatteras anymore.

**Correspondence ID:** 415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 15:32:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 15:32:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 417 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 15:32:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 418 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I spent 8 years living along the NC coast & know how perilous the situation is for many of these endangered species.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 419 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

I am aware that a personal letter may be of more interest to you. However, after reading over letter below, I can think of no way to improve on what is suggested by Audubon. Please consider their proposal carefully, and I pray that you will act in the interest of the needs of wildlife and of the public who wish to enjoy the beach without the disturbance of ORV's.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

I'm a North Carolina resident and I am in favor of restrictions on ORV's on the beach. We've seen how these restrictions bring back wildlife - don't stop them now!

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 422    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Where I come from, Cape Cod, ORV use is restricted except in designated areas to protect the fragile dunes and beaches from man made erosion. This will also help preserve the birds and wildlife and tranquility of the NC seashore for everyone's enjoyment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 423    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to everyone.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 428    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan.  
\*Equal access is already provided for all visitors. The current consent decree has turned management of the National Seashore over to special interest groups. Closures in place before the consent decree were proven to be adequate for wildlife success. The current plan does not represent a balance for current users and wildlife. As has been in the past ORV use should remain allowed within the park and all of the beach should be available year round for ORV users pedestrians and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. \* Put our Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources of the Seashore should come first. Studies should indicate bird use in areas other than the National Seashore such as the barrier islands surrounding the area so as to indicate an accurate indication of wildlife use. Resource closures are not fair and have not proven to affect the outcome of birds breeding on our seashore. Closure would not be necessary if the proper data had been collected prior to the consent decree. The previous plan before the consent decree set aside adequate areas that were free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan represent a minority opinion and should allow for reasonable travel around them to protect the best public interest.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras National Seashore and look forward to a complete return of the Seashore to the public use as it once was. FREE and OPEN for ALL!  
Sincerely, Ryan Young 4419 Pine Hollow Dr Wilmington, NC, 28412

---

**Correspondence ID:** 431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 16:03:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 432    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 16:03:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 433    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should become the basis for the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. This is extremely important. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 434    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 16:03:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 435    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 16:03:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 436    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 16:03:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 437    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 16:04:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 438    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 16:33:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 439    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 16:33:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 440    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 16:58:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 441    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 17:03:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 442    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:03:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 443    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Tschopp, Angela R

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:05:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 444    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:06:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 445    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:06:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 446 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Scoville, Pam  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:13:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 447 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McCurdy, David  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:20:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello NPS  
 My opinion is that the ORV access should be expanded or at least remain as is. I visit the Outer Banks regularly and love being able to drive off road. In Volusia county in FL Turtles have made a come back just by keeping traffic off the dune areas. They currently use poles to deliniate where vehicles can travel. This may be overkill but it is a successful example.  
 Thank you for the access we currently enjoy and for all the hard work of the park service.  
 David McCurdy

**Correspondence ID:** 448 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** keller, deborah  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO vehicles should be on beaches that have protected species...turtles on cape hatteras are very fragile...NO VEHICLES. go somewhere else!

**Correspondence ID:** 449 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:22:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect Hatteras National Seashore. This is a great sea shore I have visited while staying in the outerbanks. This has to be protected from ORV use. ORV's threaten nesting birds that migrate through my state of Virginia and the whole east coast of North America. ORV use on beaches will destroy these birds for all Americans. Also ghost crabs and local crustations and mollusks that feed the birds will be killed. Plead put a high strongly enforced fine on ORV use on the Seashore. ORV use also ruins the. Experience for beach walkers.

**Correspondence ID:** 450 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:34:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 451 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McQuillin, Steven  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:50:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,  
 As the longtime owner of two Cape Hatteras vacation cottages and as a person who has been coming to Cape Hatteras for nearly 50 years and loves the island and its beauty, I wish to offer two comments about the proposed beach access policy.  
 1. Pedestrian and pet access are an important element of the beach. I love to walk along the beach with my dog from Avon to Buxton, down to the point and through Buxton Woods. We always respect nature and I see absolutely no conflict with nature by having pedestrian and pet access, so long as reasonable rules of conduct are developed and observed.  
 2. It seems very important to develop a plan for preserving historic manmade and cultural features in the area, either as part of this effort or as a separate mandate.  
 thank you very much,  
 Steve McQuillin

**Correspondence ID:** 452 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 17:51:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think it would be a good idea to try to remove houses from the Ocean front to allow plenty of space for the sand to shift back and forth. Also we should develop means to prevent people walking on the beach from crushing live crustaceans and mollusks buried in the sand and work out regulations to allow migrating birds to have sufficient time on the beach to feed.

**Correspondence ID:** 453 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:03:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Humans have enough of the planet. Save some for the wildlife. Stop ORV usage this is insane.

**Correspondence ID:** 454    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:03:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 455    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:03:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 456    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:03:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:09:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you not to sacrifice legitimate human leisure, pleasure and sporting activities to protect animal life on the Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore. Your plan, in my judgement, will severely change beach access and length of access. As a result, there will be restrictions placed on the human beings for whom the National Seashore was originally created. The National Seashore is not a wildlife preserve. Additionally, this plan would have a negative financial impact of the two homes I own in Avon NC and lessen their value. Who will compensate me for these losses of their value? The proposed plan even goes farther than the present consent agreement. Finally, the plan shows little sensitivity to the local families on Hatteras island--especially infringing upon and impacting negatively on their ability to earn a living which would support their families. You can do better and protect the rights of everyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Crouch, Oscar  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:11:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:16:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 460    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tergesen, Ron J  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
 I believe educating on the ORV drivers on proper beach driving practices before allowing access to the outer beaches will help to avoid any destruction of sensitive beach habitat and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 461    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Garriga-Lopez, Adriana M

**Received:** Apr.23,2010 18:21:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 462    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mikell, David S  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 18:32:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, no off road vehicles on Hatteras

---

**Correspondence ID:** 463    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 18:33:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 464    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 18:33:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 465    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 18:38:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live on Hatteras Island and spend time on the beach every day. I love the beach and all the wild creatures that live here and depend upon it. I also enjoy seeing people recreate and families relaxing and playing. I understand why people want to drive on the beach, nevertheless, without further discussion, and after weighing the many factors, I believe it is detrimental in all ways - for the general public and for the wildlife, and for the coastal erosion. I believe we need walkways for access - many more walkways.

---

0008878

**Correspondence ID:** 466    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:39:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
Respectfully, Dale Prillaman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 467    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rawlins, Anna  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:41:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 468    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:41:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative C in the review process for dealing with off-road vehicles is the best solution for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 469    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 18:56:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 470    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:03:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 471    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras national Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews. Additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 472    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:03:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 473    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:03:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:05:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique value to each person who visits. There is an ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that

beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

The Cape Hatteras areas has the best recreational activities on the East Coast. I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. One of the main reasons my daughters and I visit the area every year is because the balance between beach access and preservation is at it's highest level at Cape Hatteras. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come. Thank you for your time, Meg Nealis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:05:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 476    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:06:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:11:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 478    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:12:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 479    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:16:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 480    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Matthews, Ellie  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:29:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vacation there often. ATVs are noisy and bad for the fauna. Many will suffer for the pleasure of a few who probably have paid big bucks to a lobbyist to passed

**Correspondence ID:** 481 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:33:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 482 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:35:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 483 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:43:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come. Thanks, Damian

**Correspondence ID:** 484 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 19:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 485 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 20:11:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a regular visitor to the Outer Banks for 30 years I strongly support Alternative C.  
Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 486 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,23,2010 20:14:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be

held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 487    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 20:33:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 488    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 20:33:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
This is the rules at the Cape Hatteras website: Cape Hatteras National Seashore contains a wealth of natural and cultural resources. Off-road vehicles (ORVs) are one way for visitors to enjoy the seashore's ocean beaches and sound-side waters. Please use the following links and information for details on beach driving and beach access.  
?\*"New"\* (April 2010) Frequently Asked Questions: Beach Access (pdf 173kb) ?Night Beach Driving Permit ?Current Google Earth Interactive Beach Access Map ?The weekly Beach Access Report can be found on our park news release page, April-October ?Beach Driving at Cape Hatteras National Seashore brochure (pdf - includes map, regulations, and tips for beach driving) ?2008 Consent Decree Information Updated information on the seashore's Off-Road Vehicle Negotiated Rulemaking and Management Plan process is available at the National Park Service Planning, Environment and

Public Comment website.

There does seem to be good rules already in place if you do more research on the Frequently Asked Questions. I am looking to future information to see how these rules are going to hold up. I believe that the voters of North Carolina should all be notified about their rights to speak openly on this matter at the your site. It is imperative to call a halt to such destruction, and make this the case that sets the precedent for future decisions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 20:37:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 491    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 20:43:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore must first and foremost function as a safe and healthy habitat for its indiginous marine species, sea turtles, birds and mice. With adequate rules in place to regulate the activities of the human population, especially the use of ORVs across the sands, the dunes and littoral areas, the National park Service will be able to preserve and protect this ecosystem and also allow for responsible recreational activity. Adequate means the plan chosen should not endanger the natural beach environment or its creatures.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 492    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Reynolds, Peter  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 20:48:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to you concerning Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This is a wonderful place that holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value.  
Beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast. If not regulated correctly off-road vehicle use will detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that preservation is the most important aspect. If full preservation is not possible, Alternative C provides an adequate compromise position that benefits the animal species yet still guarantees that people can continue to use it in a number of ways.  
I ask that you pick the strongest solution possible to protect and preserve this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 493    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 20:53:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 494    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** O'Neil, Steve  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 20:56:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
Please consider Alternative C.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 21:03:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 496    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 22:03:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 497    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 22:15:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Outer Banks Chapter of the Surfrider Foundation recognizes the unique ecological, recreational and economic value of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We further recognize that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. We understand that for decades the Park Service has allowed access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches by Off Road Vehicles (ORV) with minimal restriction or oversight and that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. The Outer Banks Chapter supports beach preservation and protection efforts, but feel that a temporary and or permanent ban on ORV access to these beaches could have an immediate detrimental impact on the Outer Banks economy, and severely limit public access to groups that appreciate, use, and support the protection of these coastal resources. We believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved.  
It is difficult for one that has not spent significant time on the Outer Banks to consider how limited access to beaches would become without ORV use, access that is the very reason that people from all over the world come to the Outer Banks to visit. In our small community where much of the oceanfront has been developed by homes, this small stretch of National Park is truly one of the last protected places to enjoy the unique resources on Hatteras Island. Hatteras Island offers world class surfing and fishing, much of which can be attributed to its remote location that is accessible only by ORV's. At this time the Outer Banks Chapter of Surfrider Foundation believes that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
The Outer Banks Chapter implores all parties involved in this issue to find a balance between access, protection and preservation. We recommend managing access of these areas through a combination of permitting, limiting the number of vehicles, and closures when necessary to protect the migratory species that use this area seasonally. The Outer Banks Chapter of Surfrider Foundation supports protection and preservation, and in this unique situation does support the reasonable use of ORVs to allow public access to this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 498    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rouhana, Alexander M  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 22:35:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 23:03:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Smith, John B  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray:  
Thank you for opening the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore to public comment. Several alternative plans are presented in the draft environmental impact statement.  
If altered to provide greater pedestrian access, Alternative D, identified as "environmentally preferred," is the alternative I would support. This approach would allow for greater non-ORV use of the Seashore as well as have less negative impact on wildlife ? one of the very environmental resources the Seashore was created to protect.  
I support the principles the Audubon Society represents for the DEIS process, should Alternative D and its modification not be enacted:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
John B. Smith 56 E. Union Street/Athens, OH/45701

---

**Correspondence ID:** 501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dambrosi, Anthony M  
**Received:** Apr.23,2010 23:54:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 502    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 00:03:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

0008886

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	503	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, Debbie				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,24,2010 00:32:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	504	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,24,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area. As an environmental educator, I feel strongly about protecting and perserving natural areas. Hatteras is such a unique place and we must do everything in our power to keep it that way. As the mother of three small children, I want my little ones AND their little ones to be able to enjoy the beauty Hatteras has to offer for years to come.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	505	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	MCGUINN, DEBORAH				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,24,2010 05:04:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area. I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	506	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Ahdoot, Samantha W				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,24,2010 05:08:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area. I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	507	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,24,2010 05:34:01						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be						

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 508    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 05:34:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 509    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 05:37:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come. Thank you, Bob Schaller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 510    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kraft, Stephen F  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 05:51:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 511    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 05:58:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 512    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 06:02:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Option C in the ORV management plan for Hatteras.  
Kathy Reinhold

---

**Correspondence ID:** 513    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 06:03:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 514    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 06:04:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 515    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Miller, Barbara  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 06:23:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 516    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 06:36:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have visited the outer banks for two decades and spend at least two weeks a year on Ocracoke Island where I surf, paddleboard, swim and enjoy the beach. Sometimes, I camp in the NPS campground. The outer banks are unique in their wildness and raw landscape. This undeveloped resource and it's natural inhabitants are a rare treasure that should be protected to the fullest extent and not taken for granted! Over the years, I have noticed the tourism population grow and grow on the banks. It also seems like everyone now has a 4WD vehicle. Gone are the days when it was just fisherman driving with great respect and caution to find their spots on the beach. Now, the majority of beach drivers seems to be tourists mainly joyriding. My observation of these tourists driving on the beach is that they lack the basic knowledge of how to properly drive on the beach. These tourist also seem to lack basic respect for the beach, it's conservation and the safety of others. Numerous times a year and sometimes numerous times A DAY, I witness speeding, near collisions with other vehicles, driving on the dunes, driving below the water line, driving past beach access boundary markers, drinking and driving, littering, aggressive driving and near misses with beach goers (including small children) and their pets. There have been no less than five times that a vehicle has come within a few feet of hitting me as I sunbathed on the beach and it wasn't that I was hard to see as I had an 8ft. sunshelter set up over a cooler, two colorful chairs and beach blankets, etc! If ORV are going to continue to be allowed access there needs to be significant and severe restrictions implemented and then enforced. Perhaps a permitting process that involves a fee and an educational requirement so that all ORV drivers are at least competent and then hopefully respectful. ORV access should no longer be a free for all!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 517    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stadnik, George  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 06:54:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 As a avid user of this natural resource, I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 518    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
Also, I am a student at Stony Brook Southampton, the ONLY campus dedicated to sustainability and an extended marine course. I myself am becoming a marine biologist and am doing work at the Riverhead Foundation for Marine Mammals Research and Preservation. When it comes down to issues like these, I know a pretty good amount of knowledge and what would be BEST for all, including our planet and its OTHER inhabitants. Please take my word for when I say Alternative C is the best choice for everyone and everything.

**Correspondence ID:** 519    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 07:04:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 520    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr.24.2010 07:06:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support option c for beach access

**Correspondence ID:** 521    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 07:09:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 522    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

**Correspondence ID:** 523    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 07:34:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 524    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 07:34:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Although I have never had the opportunity to visit Hatteras, I do believe that an overuse of off roading vehicles will damage the beach and surrounding natural areas.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 526    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

While I am an out of state resident, I have visited the Outer Banks several times over the past decade. I am an avid surfer and birder who is drawn back time and time again to the rugged beauty of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I believe that Alternative C is the best option to preserve the critical migratory bird habitats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 527    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Pace, Freve  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 07:57:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have never shared my thoughts regarding the management plan officially before, but I believe it is important that all of us share with you how various decisions may affect our lives.  
 My family and I own a home in Buxton where we spend about 3/1/2 months per year, and where my husband and I hope to retire in a year or so. When we are on Hatteras Island, we enjoy walking and sunning on the Buxton beach, walking and bicycling on the park road to the lighthouse and around the Buxton campground, and driving our truck between ramp 34 and Frisco to watch sunsets, pick up shells, have an occasional picnic dinner, or a walk with our dog Millie.  
 On these drives, we enjoy watching and trying to identify the many shorebirds that are so different than those here in Ohio, and we respect the need to protect their habitat. However, honestly, it does seem kind of ridiculous to "protect" species during the spring and summer that are truly not endangered at the expense of thousands of people's ability to enjoy the seashore.  
 Having said that, I also believe it is equally ridiculous to allow driving on all parts of the seashore. As much as I love our beach drives, when I look at the effects of all the tire tracks on the driving parts of the beach vs the pristine look of the Buxton, and other beaches, where there is no driving, there is a difference. People who want to walk on an undisturbed stretch of beach should have that right too. And I don't understand why "walkers" should be restricted from parts of the seashore for any real length of time. If walkers can be expected to respect turtle closures, why can't they be expected to respect bird closure areas?  
 In summary, I guess you would say I am a moderate in regards to the plan's design. I oppose closing huge stretches of the recreational seashore for all human access during the nesting months, and I also oppose the notion that anyone should be able to drive anywhere at anytime.  
 One final thought: I will be very sad if Millie is prohibited from riding in our truck to watch the sunset or to walk on her leash with me while I look for shells.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 528    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 07:59:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The following is a letter I wrote to the Island Free Press Friday, April 4, 2008. The last time this issue came to a head; I believe it still rings true. <http://www.islandfreepress.org/CatBeachAccessIssues.html> I packed my truck last night. This morning, my family and I will drive 12 hours to Cape Hatteras. We have been visiting Hatteras since the early 70's. What I have always loved about the Outer Banks, is that I could do anything there. My father shared his love of the ocean, sound, and marshes that are the cape's barrier islands. My father is now retired to Cape Cod; I now live and work on Long Island. While we live in places that are similar to Cape Hatteras? They are still not that wonderfully special place where I learned how to play with its forces; [waves, wind, and, water]: Feed from its bounty: [fish, crab, and shellfish]; and stand in awe of its beauty. That's why we keep coming back. But if you ban four wheel drive access, you will make it impossible for me to share the same experience with my family that my father shared with me. Sure, you may need to limit or regulate 4X4 access. There are just too many SUV's around today. But an outright ban is unnecessary! There are just too many of us who use 4X4 access responsibly who will be hurt in the process. We understand that the beach is a fragile and ever changing place, best accessed by foot, or by responsible four wheel access. The last thing you want is hard structures like roads and parking lots. So, I will make my "pilgrimage" to the OBX today. I've already paid for my rental house. Because of this love for the Cape, we visit in the spring or fall. Any sunburned tourist can love the Cape in the summer? But we rent homes, and spend dollars when it is 50 degrees, 40 knots, and pouring rain. And we love it! Take away our access, and see how many of show up next season. Postscript: Saturday April 24, 2010? I am a member of Surfrider's Central Long Island Chapter, The Long Island Beach Buggy Association, The North Shore Yacht Club, as well as an avid year round Waterman. I believe in 4X4 access not merely for convenience. Although that is part of it. [It is difficult to drag your family to the beaches I love, especially when some of your family are unable to walk one or two hundred yards.] I believe it is the flexibility of 4X4 access that makes it environmentally responsible. Barrier Islands are nothing more than shifting sand bars. They are constantly in motion. With responsible 4X4 access you can better utilize the beaches they create and take away. If a certain area is eroding, or needs to be protected as a nursing or nesting area? you can simply close, or limit access to that beach. Temporarily; of course. If you build "hard structures": like buildings and roads: you are forced to engage in irresponsible dredge and fill operations, as well as poor beach management practices, like building bulkheads, and jetties. These practices do more harm than good. In many cases, regressively uses taxpayer money to subsidize, ie protect some rich guys home, that should never have been built in the first place. Tomorrow, I will attend a Dune Grass Planting at Gilgo beach in NY. As a 4X4 user, I fully support the closing of this, and other beaches to Off Road traffic right now. [Long Island beaches, where I live took a real beating this winter.] So that is why I will be planting Dune Grass on Sunday. It will give the beach a fighting chance to replenish its self. And I will once again be able to drive on and access that beach at some point in the future. It's responsible 4X4 users like me,; or some irresponsible rich guy with a million dollar home. You tell me what's better for the Environment. Thanks for listening,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 529    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 08:04:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 530    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Crawford O'Brien, Jana

**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
 It is a common sense approach that benefits everyone. Please consider adopting Alternative C. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 531    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Walke, Jenifer B  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 08:29:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 08:30:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe humanity is killing our environment with over use and uncaring people and using vehicles on beaches will destroy the echo system. The are fewer ghost crabs on the beach and i'm sure other small crabs and vegetation will be killed by over use. Why can't we go to these wild place and enjoy the water and land as it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 533    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 08:34:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 534    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was born in NC, moved to FL when I was 2 years old. I haven't been able to visit the outer banks yet, but plan to very soon. Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. I have seen the Florida beaches restored and protected to give us a beautiful natural area to visit.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
 Melissa L Purtill

---

**Correspondence ID:** 535    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hess, Anthony G  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 08:43:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a property owner in Frisco. Like many other out of staters we love coming down to CHNS for the beaches, seeing old friends and the many shops

0008893

and eaterys that are on Hatteras Island. If we couldn't get on the beaches we would sell our property and look elsewhere for a vacation home. I would hate to see limited access to the beaches at CHNS. The economy of the Island depends on the beaches to support the many business that are on the Island. I request that the NPS take a long hard look at what restricting access to the beaches would do the the way of life that has been going on for years on Hatteras Island. Thank you for your time  
Anthony G Hess

---

**Correspondence ID:** 536    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Vaughn, Keith  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 08:49:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 537    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 09:04:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 09:04:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. As a windsurfer and beach comber, this is my favorite national park, and I place great value on it.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and

preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support the NPS recommended Alternative F, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource, at least until it is threatened by climate change induced sea-level rise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** P, R E  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 09:29:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a long time visitor to the Outer Banks of North Carolina I support Alternative C the ballanced solution. If access to the beach is denied to people who fish and surf, the local economy will go in the tank and unemployment will skyrocket as millions of people will go elsewell for the vacations and recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 09:34:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the oppotunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more oppotunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 09:34:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the oppotunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more oppotunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
For the fifty years I have visited Cape Hatteras National Park. During that time there has been a tremendous increase in the number of people using the park and surrounding areas. I think it is important to protect our natural resources and wildlife and to set aside areas that are free of ORV use year round for breeding, migration and wintering of birds, sea turtles and other animals.  
Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.  
Sincerely,  
Suzanne Magalis PO Box 1699 Cashiers, NC 28717

---

**Correspondence ID:** 543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 09:34:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the oppotunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more oppotunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 09:34:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** DeLibero, Linda  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to support Surfrider Foundation's position on ORV use in Hattaras. As someone who cares deeply about our oceans and shore preservation, I wanted to put my two cents' in through them. Their statement:  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come. thank you! LD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 09:58:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 09:58:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 548    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 10:04:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,24,2010 10:04:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,24,2010 10:14:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** HELLO, I A WRITING TO OPPOSE THE CLOSURE/RESTRICTIONS OF THE BEACH ACCESS POSSIBLY OCCURING IN CAPE HATTERAS. I AM AN EXPERIENCED SURFER, FISHERMAN & BEACH GOER AND I HAVE LIVED AS FAR NORTH AS JEW JERSEY TO CURRENTLY THE WEST COAST OF FLORIDA. CAPE HATTERAS HAS AND ALWAYS BE A PART OF ME AND MY FAMILY BECAUSE OF ITS SPECIAL QUALITIES SUCH AS AND NOT LIMITED TO EXCELLENT SURING, FISHING, NATURAL REMOTE CLEAN BEACHES, FRIENDLY LOCALS, AND MUCH MUCH MORE. VISITING BOTH RECREATIONAL AND COMPETATIVELY (SURFING THE ESA EASTERNS SINCE 1987)DRIVING ON THE BEACH TO A REMOTE AREA WITH YOUR FAMILY IS SOMETHING THAT WE LOOK FORWARD TO EVERY TIME WE ARRIVE ON THE ISLAND. IT IS AN ADVENTURE THAT I LOVE MORE THAN MY KIDS OR THE YOUNG ONES WITH US ON THAT TRIP.

PLEASE CONSIDER KEEPING THEM OPEN TO THE PUBLIC. I KNOW THE EXPERIENCED PARK EMPLOYEES AND RESPECTFUL PEOPLE WILL CONTINUE TO PRESERVE THE AREAS IN CONSIDERATION. KNOWING THEY ARE AT RISK FROM REMOVAL TO PUBLIC USE, I BELIEVE USERS WILL BE A LOT MORE WILLING TO FOLLOW WHATEVER RULES ARE APPLIED TO CONTINIE USE IN SUCH A UNIQUE BEAUTIFUL AREA. SINCERLY, LAWRENCE S.POLLIN AND FAMILY

**Correspondence ID:** 551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** layton, kermit I

**Received:** Apr,24,2010 10:18:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not close the beaches to human access. The surfers can help with enviromental issues with manpower. There has to be a common ground that can be found.

**Correspondence ID:** 552    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,24,2010 10:34:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hicks, Thomas  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:00:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are deeply concerned regarding the direction being taken by the National Park Service (NPS) with the draft "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement." We strongly believe that the positions developed by the Coalition for Beach Access are reasonable and provide adequate protection for endangered species. We are particularly concerned with the NPS proposed positions limiting beach access for pedestrians with leashed pets. For example, DEIS states that "Pets would be prohibited within all designed breeding shorebird Species Management Areas (SMAs) from March 15 to Oct. 15," and "Pets would be prohibited within all nonbreeding shorebird SMAs that are otherwise open to recreation use." This is an unacceptable proposal.

Current NPS regulations require pets with pedestrians to be on leashes no longer than six feet. This requirement is more than adequate to prevent pets from damaging protected species. Pets on leashes do not damage protected species. Statements in the DEIS that reference reports citing damage to protected species from pets are not accurate reflections of conditions where pets are required to be on leashes. Prohibiting pets completely from beach areas, particularly in front of villages, will significantly disrupt vacationer experiences and cause vacationers to seek other more pet friendly beach areas such as in Currituck County. Implementing the NPS proposed actions regarding pets would significantly affect demand for rental properties on Hatteras Island, a hardship that is not accurately reflected in the DEIS.

Many families choose to take their pets with them on beach vacations. This is an important criterion for vacationers choosing a beach destination. Our family makes it a priority to have our pets with us on our beach vacations. One of the reasons we purchased a home on Hatteras Island was the beach access for our walks with our pets. Adoption of restrictive beach access rules for pets may force us and others to leave Hatteras Island for more pet friendly beach areas.

Proposals within the DEIS to limit beach access beyond current requirements would present a significant and unnecessary hardship on rental property owners and vacationers. We strongly urge your department to adopt the positions of the Coalition for Beach Access, particularly with respect to pet access to beaches.

**Correspondence ID:** 554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:04:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Gibbons, Brian T  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore hold unique ecological, recreational and economic value. The beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but if not regulated correctly Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:11:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It's important to leave this stretch of beach undeveloped and relatively remote, to remind people what the land originally looked like, to maintain the ecosystems, and to provide an escape for people from the developed world. I prefer option C. Thanks so much, and please keep in mind how important maintaining a connection to the natural world is for the mentality of the citizenry.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:15:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** justice, Cynthia P  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:20:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We encourage our Park Service to please consider alternative C.  
Thank you very much, Dr. and Mrs. Michael Justice Asheville, NC 28803

---

**Correspondence ID:** 559    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nixon, John R  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:21:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the proposed regulations for ORV use in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. As a tax payer, OBX property owner and longtime resident of North Carolina, I believe this Recreation Area needs to be preserved first and foremost for the enjoyment of the public. For decades the Cape Hatteras and all of the Outer Banks have relied heavily of fishing and tourism. To date, these continue to be the prime economic engine for the community. Having grown up fishing the ocean and sound, I know first hand how important ORV access is to this area. Without ORV most of the seashore is inaccessible to the average surf fisherman. Hauling gear for miles across the sand is hardly how I'd define a happy recreational outing. I remember my dad teaching me how to drive of the beach and later taking my own Jeep out to go on fishing trips. I just welcomed my first child into the world two months ago. I want to be able to share the same experiences I had with my dad with her. I remember standing in the water over looking Cape Point while the blue fish blitzed. I remember standing on the north shore of Ocracoke fishing the inlet for drum. These are priceless memories that I fell are entitles to all North Carolinians and all Americans. Please don't take these precious spots away from us.  
Here are a few points of concern I share with several others:  
1) You want to close Hatteras Inlet, North End Ocracoke Island, Ramp 27-Ramp 30 (Salvo) year round. I am completely opposed to this. There are miles and miles of beach that are already non-accessible to ORVs up and down the Outer Banks. We aren't seeking an expansion of ORV areas, just what we've been historically entitled to.  
2) Why do non-endangered or non threatened species like Oystercatchers get so much area closed for them? 3) Piping plover buffers. Let's examine this. By NPS reasoning this bird is endangered and should be protected. I agree. People need to be aware of these nests and taught to look out for the birds. That said, why isn't the same level of protection afforded to all endangered bird species throughout the national park system? ORV trails run through parks in Colorado, past the nesting ground of bald eagles yet no one is suggesting a stop to that action. The same can be said of trails in California, Utah and other NPS areas where endangered birds nest.  
4) NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem. This includes dredge and spoil islands that have less predator presence. (p124)  
5) Why is it okay to tamper with nature in some instances but not others? NPS sets aside areas of beach to "extirpated" sea beach amaranth, but it's not okay to clear vegetation at Cape Point ponds to create more favorable piping plover habitat.  
6) I completely disagree with the ban on pets during the summer season. If a person is not properly managing their dog, then cite them with a ticket. Make the penalties steep if you must, but don't take away pet owners rights.  
7) Why is it okay to kill predators (greatest risk to birds and turtles), but not okay to drive on the beach at night (deterrent to predators, low risk to turtles and birds)?  
8) Finally, please consider the impact on the economic livelihood of these communities. ORVs have been supported for over half a century with businesses developed around their use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 560    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** West, Kevin  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:23:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If all people were responsible enough to take nothing but pictures and leave nothing but photos I would be a proponent of allowing more access to this national park. However, this perhaps is and will continue to be another issue of the few ruining the quality of recreation for the many. Where humans tread environmental impact and destruction is certain to follow. There is no doubt allowing more access will result in a more pollution, littering, destruction of wildlife habitat, and the sacrifice of once-pristine and practically inaccessible areas. In addition, more access eventually and invariably leads to the need for more services and infrastructure, such as equal access for the physically-challenged, bathrooms, gas stations, roads, and even outfitters--allowing more access may very well be opening up a can of worms, or at minimum providing the can opener. Certainly there is profit to be made, and increased access and development will allow the land to be more efficiently used--or used up. Over 40 yrs after the park was created we need to be asking ourselves not only if this is the best way to preserve the park for future generations, but if this is what LBJ intended. Perhaps if one can't find the motivation 'get there' and bring what they need so easily, they have no business going.  
I live on an Atlantic barrier island of central Florida and am an avid surfer and member of Surfrider Foundation. The first time I rode the ferries and visited the outer banks I was mesmerized. Their pristine beaches and dunes look exactly like those where I live in Florida, minus development and infrastructure. If there is anywhere else can one visit, enjoy, and experience what the outer banks has to offer I have not heard of it. Once this untouched area is gone, it will be gone forever.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 561    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:34:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 562    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I speak for 'wild'life as well as my own family's future.  
I take issue with \* Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on at only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.  
Motor noise impinges on my right to quiet. I would like to prohibit Off Road Vehicles all year round, period. Families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:34:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 11:46:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It seems reasonable that public lands should be shared in their use by all interested parties and rules/law should reflect that. We have similar problems here in Hawaii where the shoreline waters are used by fisherman, surfers, boaters, swimmers and issues of use are addressed accordingly (not always without acrimony, unfortunately).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 565    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 12:04:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 566    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 12:04:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 567    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 12:04:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 568    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 12:16:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 569    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Blackwell, Vicki H  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 13:00:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have enjoyed the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for over 35 years. I do not fish, but I prefer Cape Hatteras beaches because one can avoid the crowds at Nags Head and other popular seaside resorts. However, I am very concerned that the effort of the National Park Service to decrease the amount of accessible shoreline in the National Seashore will cause over-crowding in sections that are still open to vehicles and pedestrians. If this situation occurs, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore will lose much of its allure and popularity.  
I am also disappointed that the emphasis of the National Seashore seems to have shifted from recreation to bird and turtle protection. THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE WAS RECREATION NOT WILDLIFE REFUGE!  
In closing you will probably receive thousands of comments from Audubon, Defenders of Wildlife, and numerous other environmental activists. My question is: How many of these "environmentalists" have visited or will ever visit the Cape Hatteras National Seashore?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 570    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 13:04:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 571    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 13:16:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. Beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources in the world, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 572    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 13:20:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 573    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Peterson, Robert S

**Received:** Apr,24,2010 13:20:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a vacation rental property owner in Avon. I in principle accept and agree with the provisions of the option F plan with the following objections and suggestions: 1. I do not agree with the provisions concerning pets and their access in any non-breeding SMAs year round that are otherwise open to recreational use and any pass-through zones. Pets should be allowed in these areas with the current leash requirements. I would suggest you require a one-time pet tag with an annual fee attached to it for educational training of owners. Have the owner sign off on the provision, adults only. Permits should be available at retail stores, ranger stations and on line registration. The permit should be available before seasonal visitors come to the shore from outside the local areas. If we need a beach fire permit ORV why not pet owners permit? I also believe that pet owners should be responsible for the cleaning up and properly disposing of pet waste. Any well trained vet will tell you pet waste can be a public health risk. Provisions for enforcement and fines should be attached for failure to comply. The park service should also make available stations for proper disposal of pet waste particularly in the villages and ramp accesses. Biodegradable bags should be provided for pet owners at these stations. This is done in many state rest areas with much success. Cost to administer should be borne by the pet owners. Just so you are aware I am a responsible dog owner. 2. I question the conclusion that restricting beach access will have a negligible economic impact. Is there a way to adequately study cause and effect before the plan is adopted? I see a conclusion in your draft but there seems to be unsubstantiated evidence. 3. I applaud the recommendation of the adoption of turtle friendly lighting. I believe the municipalities and the county governments should adopt lighting ordinances for regulation and enforcement. All government agencies including the US Postal service should comply with your guidelines. The biggest offender to the creation of powerful ambient light is the Post Office in Avon. Their lighting system is so powerful that it prevents people from enjoying the stars and clearly affects turtles. The postal service has ignored repeated requests to alter their outside lighting despite the fact they do not conform to county ordinances. 4. Your beach equipment ordinance has no teeth. Twenty four hours notice before removal does not accomplish the goal of no obstructions. Confiscate the junk when you see it and make everyone aware they can retrieve it at the Ranger Station, for a fee.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 574 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Clark, John F  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 13:23:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Once again the actions of a few potentially damage the enjoyment of the masses. I feel that there needs to be a limit to the number of vehicles allowed on Hatteras. I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 575 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 13:23:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
Regards,  
Carlos Sio

---

**Correspondence ID:** 576 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 13:27:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 577 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 13:35:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 578 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 13:35:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 13:35:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 580    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 13:40:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 581    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 14:04:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 582    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 14:04:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me about the areas mentioned below as well as in the whole southeastern region of the US which has abundant wildlife, ancient and historic forests and more, that need more protections than ever!

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 583    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 14:34:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Menkes, B  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 14:41:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Schacher, Curtis L  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 14:44:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the draft DEIS with emphasis on alternate F. I have been frequent visitor to Cape Hatteras and Ocracoke since 1977 primarily for recreational fishing and family vacations. I normally frequent the area of Avon 3-4 times a year. I have read over the document and find alternate F to far exceed anything contained in the consent decree and frankly make my reasons for visiting almost useless. I see nothing that fully considers the economic impact to the area of Cape Hatteras or this region. If feel the considerations inject areas like Duck and Kill Devil Hills but do not consider this unique area around Avon and southward. Why doesn't DEIS address actual business impact. Surely it is available.  
I have been closely following the various actions of the NPS and have read input by the NPS in the NCBBA publications. Alternate F is a complete surprise to me. Additionally, I do not see that alternate F was ever reviewed within the Reg-Neg process. How do you explain this???  
I do not see where the NPS has aggressively considered experiences of other locations in NC, namely Carolina Beach Freeman Park or the state park at Fort Fisher not to mention other East Coast locations.  
I find the consideration of less restrictive closures on a five year basis insulting. Buffers should be minimized and reviewed weekly for their relevance. I find the 'ML1' closures almost beyond common sense.  
In 1937 the park service was entrusted with a unique opportunity to protect the cultural heritage of this area. My review of the DEIS leads me to the conclusion that what the NPS is protecting is their own interests. Human/ORV access is being blamed for almost all bird/turtle 'problems' yet by your statistics they account for about 3%. All the emphasis seems to be placed on restricting human access when I was always under the thought that all parks

should be for access by humans to appreciate the fullness of nature.

Thank you for your time and I hope this comment period will be used as input and not merely an exercise of government letting the people comment and then we'll do what we always intended to do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 14:56:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
 Just make sure that protecting animal species is the first priority!  
 Sincerely,  
 M. Kram

---

**Correspondence ID:** 587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 15:05:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 15:05:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 16:05:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 16:05:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 591    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Leyman, John

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 16:09:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 592    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hough, Andrew

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 16:13:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I strongly object to this plan. The 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure around a piping plover nest is way, way, WAY too much. It is equivalent to 771 acres of protection per nest. Where is the science that says each nest needs 771 acres?

The 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure around an oyster catcher nest is similarly unjustifiable by all the known science for that species. Further, the Oystercatcher is not even a federally threatened species.

The restriction against dogs on the beach from March 15th and July 31st is simply unprecedented. Where is the data that shows that this is even a problem? Who says this will even help protect the birds if dogs aren't a part of the problem?

It looks to us like environmental extremists of the worst kind have taken the litmus test approach to the entire National Seashore - including the property directly in front of THOUSANDS of existing homes. And like most single issue extremists, they simple refuse to recognize the many other significant factors that need to play into these decisions. Namely, the rights of existing property owners, the damage to the local economy, and the need to provide appropriate access to the Park to an entire nation of vacationers and other visitors.

The National Park system was created and developed to allow the entire nation a safe and beautiful place to visit. What this plan does is to create a permanent bird sanctuary, where most forms of human access are off-limits. Where is the balance? Where is the compromise? Where is the sanity?

**Correspondence ID:** 593    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 16:35:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 594    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, WALTER

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 17:09:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've been coming to Hatteras for 22 years. My kids enjoyed it and it has been part of my life with my family. Now my grandson is ready to come down to enjoy the open beaches. I feel that NPS did a good job of taking care in protecting the turtles and birds from what I could see for the last 22 years and before the (CD) was put into effect. No other place on the eastern sea board has the restriction with the bird closers as Hatteras does now. With the space used on the beach for the closers. I feel it should be given back to the NPS as before the (CD) and let the GOV. rule over the beach. Not an environmental group that looks into everything the Gov. does and try to find a little fault in it to set up a law suit to try to make more money. I not only pay the Gov. taxes each year but I also don't like the idea of my tax money going to an enviro. group when they sue. In my eyes there just another group out there taking money from the gov. that I would rather have going to schools or other groups that could use it. I could go on and on but I think you all get the idea. Use the gov. money where it belongs and don't put the country more in debt by paying enviro. groups. That money has a lot better uses for our young people. The Gov. needs to stand up to these groups and say enough is enough. You want to complain fine, we will look into it, and save and spend the money I pay in taxes where it needs to be spent. The Gov needs to pass a law where other out side groups can sue the Gov. Funny thing is I have Rheumatoid arth. the F.D.A approves the drug to go on the market. If I would die from one my wife can't sue the F.D.A only the drug manufacture. But these enviro. groups can keep taking the Gov. money and it looks like it ok.. WRONG. As for the (ORV) use on Hatteras It's been a way of life down there for along time. When we go down to Hatteras we enjoy the freedom of being able to drive on the beach too. It lets the elderly and the handicap like me to enjoy more of the beach as well as the very young with the parents that are to young to walk to far yet. Most people drive out and park and enjoy the day. Most do not just go out there and drive around all day. I hope you keep the beaches of Hatteras free and open for all. Thank you for reading.  
WALTER

---

**Correspondence ID:** 595    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Frank, Harriete M

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

My family and I have enjoyed many wonderful vacations on the Outer Banks and one of our favorite places to visit is the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We are concerned that the wishes of the minority of people who use noisy, polluting and destructive vehicles on the beach seem to outweigh the desire of the majority of citizens who would use the beach in a sustainable manner. We are wildlife watchers and relish the opportunity to quietly observe the wonderful creatures who make their home in this unique place. Please do not destroy this precious heritage for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 596    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.24,2010 18:05:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 597    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Heffron, Joshua P  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need to perserve our planet!!! Keep the offraid vehicles out of the park!! We need to save and perserve our planet and country for our future generations!!! Not the Pleasure seekers!!!! Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
Plse help us to Perserve and Save Our Enviroment!!!! Thank You!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 598    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gholson, Adam A  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 18:31:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This whole process is rediculous, plain and simple. Ive been traveling to Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands for 25 years, 5 or 6 trips per year, primarily to surf fish. I have met and come to know quite a few of the locals down there, and it pains me to see them now, in the midst of this political hurricane! Everybody is stressed out, and you can see it in their faces. They are very concerned about their livlihoods, because as anybody knows, these islands' economies are driven by tourism. People travel from all over this country to visit Hatteras' beautiful beaches and serene villages. The biggest draw for tourists, is the ability to DRIVE ON THE BEACHES! Now, you take away that right, people will stop visiting. People stop visiting, there's no income, and an entire economy will sink. I cannot honestly believe that a group of individuals, most of who have never even been to Hatteras, would want to ruin an entire way of life, over a couple of birds that havnt been able to flourish, even with the current closures in place!!! The science is bogus, anybody can see that a bird who makes its nest below the high-tide line is doomed. Any lunar tides or high onshore winds will kill these nests long before a vehicle gets close to them. These closures have been in place for a number of years now, and the reports at the ends of those years have showed ZERO evidence that closing the beaches has helped these birds! People have lost jobs, businesses have closed, and the overall tourism has dramatically decreased in the last two years. It is rediculous to close an entire stretch of beach for two birds. Mark the nest and close off a small portion to protect it; fine. When the birds move, you move the closure, not close an entire beach! Its really simple folks. As for the turtles, in Florida, turtle nests are roped off in a 15'x15' square, and those beaches see FAR more traffic than those of Cape Hatteras. Tell me whats different? Same animal, different place. If the birds wont flourish on Cape Hatteras then why not re-locate then to another area where they will? You've already killed every predator on the islands, and closed beaches to ORV use, and STILL the birds havnt done any better! Really? Can you not see that what you are doing isnt helping at all? Please do not ruin Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Use common sense and keep our beaches open for generations to come. Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 18:35:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the oppportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Have you ever taken a walk in nature with a loved one? If you have, please read on...  
This alternative plan would provide more oppportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the oppportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 19:05:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the oppportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more oppportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 19:05:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Marsh, Dan P  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
I have been surfing Hatteras for a long long time. I now bring my kids there My 7 and 5 year old both caught there 1st waves this year. We (my whole family) love Cape Hatteras - please consider Alternative C - We need a balanced solution.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

On a personal note, I am a frequent visitor to Cape Hatteras National Seashore and I appreciate the unspoiled beauty of it. I have always been very impressed with the management of the seashore. Please do not destroy what so many of us love so that people can drive on the beach just to fish. I can't believe that the benefits of that outweigh the damage it would do to the animal population and the solitude and wild beauty of the shore. I am also an avid birdwatcher and naturalist and feel that the animals already have a hard time with encroaching humanity. Don't make it worse.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 19:35:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The time is now to act on behalf of wildlife and the environment! This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Huson, Chris  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 19:53:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have enjoyed visiting Cape Hatteras several times over the years and hope to in the future. It is a wonderful part of North Carolina and our country. I think it is possible to balance wildlife and recreational use, including off road vehicles. I agree with Surfrider's recommendation: Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 19:58:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom This May Concern:  
I am a Florida Native who lived in NC for several years as a park technician in Durham at Eno River State Park. I feel at home near my coast. My passion is that the coastal ecosystems get as much help in the form of vehicle restraint as we can give them. Haven't we thought too little of our coastline and too much of people's temporary wants? Isn't our coastal eco system in a tenuous state of protection as it is? I hope the Alternative of C is chosen to best insure the protection of life, all life that lives in the environment along the sea.  
Sincerely,  
Kathryn A. Thomas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 20:05:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dunnagan, Brad M  
**Received:** Apr,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like you, employee of the Federal Government of whom the people pay, elect, and choose, to take my comment into consideration, as I am not speaking of just my own beliefs, but, as President of the Cape Hatteras SGA, I am speaking as the official representative of the students that attend the

Cape Hatteras Secondary School of Coastal Studies. I am going to start off defining the long forgotten purpose of Government, as the founding fathers wanted it to be. We the people, are more powerful than the government, including you, and I encourage you to think about governmental decisions you make. This year is an election year, and if the people, who elect the Congress, don't agree with you, then Congress can override any Executive Order by creating a law restricting it. Many people throughout the United States are tired of Private Interest groups running the country instead of the people, and unless the Government does it's job, and listens to the people, things are going to change, and we, the people, will fire you.

Anyway, I'll get to my agreements and disagreements with the DEIS Plan. I am not an animal hater, and I do believe in ethical ways of protecting animals. However, humans can only be blamed in less than 5% of the cases, while predation causes over 50% of the death of threatened/ endangered species. Although it is reasonable to place a small buffer between human activity and nesting sites, a 1000ft buffer is absurd on the basis of two reasons: 1. It is highly unfair and unjust to the human race, and 2. It also negatively impacts animals. Research shows that areas with high human traffic have less aggressive animals. When humans are around, it is natural for any kind of animal, large or small, to be scared of and either more distant or hidden. In any case the animal, if it's a predator, would be less likely to attack a weaker animal, such as a sand piper or a piping plover if humans are near. 1000ft isn't even close to near, and although it decreases the amount of human-related deaths of the piping plover (which, given the benefit of the doubt cause less than 7%) and increase predation (which amounts to 55%). Although technology has impacted the world's view of humans importance in nature, it still exists. At Camp LeJune (which is Government, run by the way, by environmental experts in the military) a 30ft. buffer zone is placed around ENDANGERED animals. The Piping Plover, which is the main animal of concern to the NPS and the Audubon Society, is ranked as being "Near Threatened" which is above the "Least Concern" rank. All in all, it would be beneficial for the residents of Hatteras Island, the Piping Plover, and the NPS if the NPS adopts a DEIS that gives the animals some room so humans can't directly interfere with them, but close enough to give humans their own freedom of the land they purchased in tax their dollars (and are still paying for with their tax dollars) and keep predators away without having to trap them (which doesn't always work.) The students at CHSSCS will be happy, the residents of Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be happy, the businesses will be happy, the Plovers will be happy and the NPS will be happy if the buffer is reduced to 30 yards.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.24,2010 22:35:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gaber, Steven A  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 00:47:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

It is my belief that allowing off-road vehicles in Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a very bad idea for a number of reasons.

- 1) It would have a disastrous effect on the birds and turtles that nest in the sandy beach areas. The breeding habitats for these animals is becoming scarcer every year. Many of them are threatened or endangered species. If ORVs are allowed in these areas, they will have even less breeding grounds.
- 2) Many migratory birds depend on Cape Hatteras National Seashore for food and resting areas during their arduous journeys. Without places to refuel and rest, many will die and their species pushed further toward extinction. If you allow ORVs to operate in the secondary dune zones, that will harm still other varieties of birds and animals.
- 3) It would have an adverse impact on the grasses that are the island's first defense against storms and erosion. These are barrier islands, subject to change from the effects of winds, tides and ocean currents. The grasses hold them together and are sensitive to physical damage. Removing the grasses or causing additional stress could endanger the very existence of the island.
- 4) It is a quality-of-life issue. Places like Hatteras National Seashore are among the last remaining undeveloped shorelines in the country that are accessible to the public. People escape from cities and suburbia to places like this. They seek to experience the awesome beauty of sand dunes, marshes and the ocean without intrusion from loud engines and noisy people drinking beer.

Your document says that you will implement rules for the drivers of ORVs to follow. My personal experience is that the people who use ORVs do not always follow rules, nor do they care one iota for the damage they inflict on the environment. More than once I have observed people driving ORVs in forbidden areas within parks in Florida. When I told them they should not be operating those vehicles in sensitive habitat areas, they were either abusive and made obscene gestures or they just ignored me. Do you think that ORV users in North Carolina will be any more observant of such rules? The only way those rules would have any effect is if they were strictly enforced with stiff penalties imposed on the first infraction. This requires additional staff at a time when budgets cuts and staff shortages are the norm.

5) It is an economic issue. Some members of the business community will claim that prohibiting ORVs will hurt the local economy. I have several answers to that assertion.

What is the number of visitors who would come to Cape Hatteras National Seashore to operate ORVs compared to the number of visitors who come there for other reasons? How many of those would not visit BECAUSE of the presence of ORVs there? How many birders visit CHNS? What is the percentage of ORV users compared to that of birders? When the bird species and overall biodiversity are reduced, do you think the birders will still come? I think birders have a greater impact on the local economy than ORV users. It would seem the only economic beneficiaries are those who sell ORVs. If owners of ORVs complain that they have no place to operate their machines, I would say they should have thought of that before they bought them.

In closing, I want to emphasize my objection to ORVs in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It would completely and negatively change the entire character of that pristine place.

There is no area within the Hatteras National Seashore to establish an area for ORV use that will not cause damage to the environment. ORVs are loud and incredibly destructive. The damage they cause is horrific. To owners of ORVs who say they have should the right to operate them at CHNS, I say

the remainder of the CHNS visiting public, as well as the birds and other animals that live and migrate there, have an even greater right to be free of ORVs in that beautiful, fragile and precious place.

Thank you for considering these comments. Steven A. Gaber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 611    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 01:06:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 612    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 05:06:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 613    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 05:09:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have been long-time visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The area is beautiful and is the economic lifeline for local residents. The beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing. Over-regulation is not necessary or needed. While I recognize migratory species nest in the area, I believe that a better balance with increased access is needed. I support Alternative C as the most appropriate solution. This provides a balance that benefits the animal species, while guaranteeing that people can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious public resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come. A balance is the only way to way to meet the needs and desires of the people that reside and visit this area with the protection and development of the wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 05:36:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 05:36:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

As a resident of NC and an avid bird watcher and protector, this issue is particularly important to me.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 617    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 05:36:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 618    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 05:52:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor to the outerbanks I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 619    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Larsen, Lewis F

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 05:56:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

Thank you for your concern for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I am concerned about your proposed rules on beach access. As an owner of two homes in Avon, NC for the past 25 years, I know Cape Hatteras very well.

Our rental homes rely on the annual visitors of guests. Our guests want access to the beach. Without our guest, we could not afford to have home ownership in Cape Hatteras. We need reasonable access to the beaches at all times of the year.

I am confident that the many hurricanes, wild fires, and over washes that we have lived through in the past 25 years, these natural occurrences have had much more damage to the beaches of Cape Hatteras than any tourist access, including walking and even driving on the beaches. The beach has healed itself sometimes with the help of man, but it has been healed each time there has been a natural disaster.

Your rule making will have a huge economic effect on Dare County, please be careful not to destroy the livelihood of the good people who live and work in Dare County. Please remember that the National Park Service was created to serve the people by giving them access to our nation's treasure, not to ban the people from the nation's treasures.

Sincerely,  
 Lewis F. Larsen

**Correspondence ID:** 620    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 06:01:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly disagree with the NPS beach driving plan. It does not allow enough access to the best fishing spots. Fishing at Cape Point has been a tradition here longer than the NPS has been here. Give us our fishing areas.

**Correspondence ID:** 621    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing. But, if not regulated correctly, Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area.

I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 622    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

I absolutely support limiting vehicles on the beach and protecting the wildlife. I have been a visitor to the Outer Banks Beaches, Hatteras specifically, for 30 years and have never felt it necessary to drive on the beaches. Please follow the principles described below and save the beaches for all creatures. Part of the enjoyment and beauty of the Outer Banks is the wild setting and the wildlife that goes with it. You lose that and you have lost everything including a large population of visitors who visit your beaches because of the wildlife. Vehicles on the beach take away the beauty, peace and tranquility of the natural setting you have to offer as well as taking away the ability of wildlife to thrive.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 06:36:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 624    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 07:06:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Please keep our beaches open for all. Do we really think that govt control is good? They have killed over 700 other animal that they deemed a hazard and now we are next on the list. It is a Recreational Area.  
Franklin Reese Midothian Va 23113

---

**Correspondence ID:** 625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 07:17:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have visited the Outer Banks for purposes of surfing for the last fifteen years. I have no intent of returning should a ban or some type of access restriction be implemented. Good luck with tourism if that happens given the amount of surfers, fishermen, and families who travel from all over the east coast to visit. Instead of punishing everyone, why don't you step up the enforcement efforts and stiffen penalties against those who don't care about keeping this gift pristine and full of wildlife as it has been in the past.  
Here's a suggestion on a ban: no Cadillac Escalades, Hummers, or Lincoln Navigators with New York or New Jersey plates; no males with white hats on sideways who wear Adidas flip flops with white socks, with female companions who wear hoop earrings, black stretch pants, and Bon Jovi hairdos; anyone who meets the above referenced description and claim that they work as a DJ at a club, and spend any more than six hours a week in the gym.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have just returned to Connecticut from Cape Hatteras National Seashore after taking my family on our annual spring vacation there. I have been going there for 28 years and we enjoy the surfing, kitesurfing and general activities including fishing horseback riding and all the other activities currently available there. I realize the seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 07:45:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 628    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cameron, Richard  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 08:07:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family has visited the Cape Hatteras National Seashore since the early 1970s. In 1983 we built a house in Avon that we still own. The hysteria caused in the last few years by a few individuals, a few if any birds, and a large national organization is beyond my comprehension. Of the many tens of thousands of visitors that vacation on the island yearly, it has been my experience that the visitors are very respectful of the environment. I can attest that this is no new phenomenon. It has been the rule rather than the exception from my experience since the early 1970s. By limiting beach access you are punishing the vast majority of visitors and locals who have been taking care of and enjoying the beach for many years. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore should be a must on everyones bucket list. It would be a travesty to limit access to the Cape when it seems that the no harm no foul seems to apply. I hope those who make the rules come to their senses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 629    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.25.2010 08:36:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

It is my wish to consider the native animals and plants of this area first and foremost; then, consider human use according to its impact on native habitat.

**Correspondence ID:** 630    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.25,2010 09:03:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 631    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.25,2010 09:06:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.25,2010 09:06:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a BALANCED SOLUTION that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come

**Correspondence ID:** 633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

0008917

**Received:** Apr.25.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The National Park Service should provide equal access to all visitors and not preferred access to ORV users. ORV use on the beaches interferes with most other uses. I note with dismay that Alternative F would only keep a mere 23% of the beaches free from ORV use year round. This is not fair. At a minimum 50% of the beaches (measured in miles of beach) should be ORV free year round.

The National Park Service needs to put more emphasis on preserving wildlife and healthy natural communities. It is very apparent that the NPS has earned failing grades in this department at Hatteras over the past several decades. One simply needs to look at the populations of threatened breeding shore birds during this time to see this.

Please recall that there are not other agencies in the Federal Government whose primary mandate is to preserve wildlife and natural communities. The National Park Service is all we have and if it fails to take the necessary measures to provide at risk wildlife with the protection it needs to recover, then there will be no recovery. This protection needs to be the primary goal to which all other goals are clearly secondary.

ORV's are intrusive. They disturb people who are minding their own business. They disturb the majority who seek out our National Parks and Sea Shores for the opportunity to appreciate the natural world. There is good evidence that they are a primary cause for the inability of the park service to manage the seashore in a manner which is leading to the return to historic population levels of many of its native breeding birds. They threaten sea turtles which have survived a huge number of threats for the past many million years.

The Park service should pay more attention to making sure that wildlife disturbance buffers are adequate. The bare minimum allocation in the preferred plan does not leave adequate room for unexpected eventualities. A bare minimum may be fine when everything is going as well as could be hoped for, but the reality is that this is seldom the case and more. More generous wildlife disturbance buffers would increase the chance that they accomplish their intended purpose.

It is of the greatest importance that any plan for the future management of the Sea Shore must establish clear goals for the recovery of the sea shore's wildlife. Targets must be explicit, annual reviews must be transparent and in the hands of people recognized in the scientific community as experts in the field. The base line cannot be the sea shores present degraded ability to support wildlife, but must reflect its historical and potential ability to harbor thriving communities of turtles, plants, breeding and over wintering birds. If the targeted improvements are not reached in a given year, then additional protections should be in place by the next year.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 634 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Cody Jr, Neal E

**Received:** Apr.25.2010 09:12:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the DEIS due to the negative impact the restrictions will have on visitor experience. The NPS has not provided a list of reported incidents that support the assumptions made regarding motorized vs non motorized recreation use.

My wife and I first discovered Ocracoke Island over 20 years ago while on a discovery vacation traveling the coastline. Being from the mountains of NC our shortest trip to ocean was to South Carolina. The uniqueness of the Beach access by vehicle on Ocracoke was a major reason we then chose to make annual trips to Ocracoke with our growing family. The ability to access the beaches by car created a great experience for our family due to the convenient access. If the currently proposed restrictions were in place when we originally visited I am sure our impression of Ocracoke would have been impacted and our future vacation beach plans would have been to return to the SC beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 635 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Cody Jr, Neal E

**Received:** Apr.25.2010 09:26:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the DEIS due to the omission of appropriate analysis on the Socioeconomic Impact of the significant restrictions proposed.

My family and I have been traveling to Ocracoke Island for over 20 years and have spent a significant amount of money on the trips. We have also become property owners on the island and all of this is due to the uniqueness of accessing the beach by vehicle and enjoying not only the nature but the villagers who make this their home and rely on tourist's spending to support the local economy. The proposed restrictions will significantly discourage visitors like my family and will negatively impact the economy on Ocracoke Island. Also now that I am a property owner on the Island this will negatively impact property values.

The desire to provide protection to the birds and turtles can surely be accomplished without the negative impact to the economy and culture.

Also with the vast beach area of Portsmouth Island just to the south of Ocracoke, the overall negative impact on the wildlife is miniscule compared to the negative impact on the human life this DEIS provisions will have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 636 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** Apr.25.2010 09:26:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 637 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.25.2010 09:36:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Chapman, Shawn  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 09:39:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid fisherman and hunter I still consider myself as a representative of the goal of conservation. For over 2000 years people have survived on this earth by different forms of hunting and fishing: even those that are opposed to the taking of other life forms still benefit daily from the activities which they are against. The effects of human intervention on the outer banks area are noticeable, yet pale in comparison to what devastation mother nature deals out every year. Closing an area of the shore to ORV use, but watching an NPS vehicle drive through the same area is in my opinion a slap in the face. Any human influence in nature, either good or bad, is still unnatural, period. Regulations regarding speed limits are needed as well as creel and size limits on fish. Animals that use the shore as a place to nest or breed will survive only if they can win the battle against the elements, not whether they can elude an ORV's tire.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 639    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 09:54:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with the coalition's position statement and am adamant that the preferred NPS alternative F has no consideration for the long time residents and visitors to the villages of Hatteras Island and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore RECREATIONAL area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 640    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Finlayson, Ben  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 10:04:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very dissatisfied with the NPS new proposal to manage Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I very much prefer and would wish to see this recreational area managed as it was prior to the Consent Decree. I very much miss the freedoms that we had that made the Hatteras experience what it once was.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 10:06:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 10:06:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Karson, Annabeth

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 10:12:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 10:37:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 645    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 10:37:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	646	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,25,2010 10:37:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would take away everyone's opportunity to enjoy the Hatteras seashore. It is not only ORV users who are affected by the closures. Anyone who enjoys taking long walks on the beach, looking for rare seashells, or just taking their family on the beach for a day of fun are severely affected by the closures. The closures are to keep everyone off of the beach. All of the signs at the closures say no humans, no vehicles, no pets!!! Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	647	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,25,2010 10:37:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of nesting birds and sea turtles. The birds and turtles were there long before we were, and deserve protection from an environmental as well as from an ethical standpoint. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</li> <li>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</li> <li>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	648	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,25,2010 10:49:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.</p> <p>Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.</p> <p>I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	649	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,25,2010 11:07:01						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</li> <li>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</li> <li>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						

**Correspondence ID:** 650    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 11:07:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 651    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 11:37:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 652    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 11:37:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	653	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,25,2010 11:52:39						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.</p> <p>I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	654	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,25,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.</p> <p>I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come. Please also consider attending one of the upcoming hearings so that your voice can be heard on this issue.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	655	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,25,2010 12:23:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>There is a special place in my heart for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The memories that friends, family, and I have and continue to make involve time spent along lonely stretches of shoreline - fishing, surfing, and talking. No more access in this capacity would greatly diminish future recreational enjoyment.</p> <p>At the same time I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the best solution for this area.</p> <p>I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come. In the end, I truly hope that my family and I can continue the great experiences we've always had when coming to Cape Hatteras Natinal Seashoer. Thanks for listening.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	656	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,25,2010 12:24:45						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I disagree with the Prohibition of PETS in the seashore during bird breeding season, including in front of the villages."(p136)= No pets in public areas-beaches, campgrounds, sound-front, foot trails, park maintained roads from March 15 -July 31</p> <p>I agree that pets should be allowed at all times utilizing the six foot leash rule.</p> <p>I disagree with the NPA proposed Alternative F restrictions because they far exceed those under the Consent Decree, the Interim Management Strategy, and the de facto ORV plan previously in place under Superintendent's Order #7.</p> <p>I disagree with the assessment made by NPS that: "Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users." (p. vi)</p> <p>I agree with the need to ask the question: Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents? Because</p> <p>? In 10 years, only 1 minor incident involving a stuck vehicle and a pedestrian was disclosed. The driver was not blamed by those involved, nor was he charged. (p. 268)</p> <p>I disagree with the assessment by NPS: "Because it is not administered by the NPS, the seashore cannot direct the visitor use at Pea Island NWR." (p. 1)</p> <p>I agree with asking the question: Why does NPS refuse to acknowledge that Pea Island is a prime, pedestrian-only area for visitors to the seashore and overstate the need for more ORV free areas?</p> <p>I disagree with the NPS position: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." (p. 210)</p> <p>I agree with facts related to current ORV access that:</p> <p>? No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs.</p> <p>? ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve.</p> <p>? Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations.</p> <p>I agree with the statement by NPS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" (p. xxiv)</p> <p>But I also agree then the question needs to be asked: Why is capacity more restrictive on Bodie Island and Ocracoke than at Cape Point? (p. xxiv).</p> <p>(Bodie Island &amp; Ocracoke -260 vehicles per mile and Cape Point ?400 vehicles per mile). This seems to be in conflict with the earlier assessment made by NPS regarding "Carrying Capacity"</p> <p>I also agree that the question needs to be asked of the NPS: Why do ORV counts provided for Memorial Day and July 4, 2009 which state: " ramp 4:includes Bodie Island Spit" and "ramp 43 to ramp 49:includes Cape Point" fail to recognize Bodie Island Spit and Cape Point were closed to ORV access on these dates due to resource protection closures, which thereby increased ORV congestion at ramps 4, 43, 44, and 49? (p. 265)</p> <p>I also agree that the question needs to be asked of the NPS: Why are buffers and closures administered such that more people are forced into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience?</p> <p>I disagree with the statement made by NPS: Shorter Off-Season ORV access on South-facing Villages (p. xix)</p> <p>I agree that the question needs to be asked: Why are Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages closures to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages? (p. 23)</p> <p>I disagree with the NPS assessment of Restrictive Species Management Areas (p. 468) Where they state:</p> <p>NPS: Established based on annual habitat assessment. NPS: Manage each SMA using ML1 or ML2 procedures. NPS: ML1 ?No pedestrian or ORV access during entire breeding season NPS: ML2 ?pedestrian only corridor thru SMA at Bodie Island Spit NPS: ML2 -pedestrian &amp; ORV corridor thru SMA at Cape Point, South Point</p> <p>I agree with the opinion that: ML1 is overly restrictive. Pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding &amp; nesting season (within guidelines) to maintain access.</p> <p>I disagree with the NPS assessment of Limited Pedestrian and ORV Corridors (p. 468) because:</p> <p>NPS: Only recognized in ML2 managed SMAs NPS:S MA management reverts to standard buffers when bird breeding activity first observed</p>						

I agree with the opinion that: Pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

I disagree with the NPS Large, Inflexible Buffers (p. 121-127) because they are too large, too restrictive and do not allow for ORV pass-thru only corridors

I agree with the opinion that:

- ? buffers use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access is always maintained
- ? Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded

I disagree with the overall assessment made by NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies Address because the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival with Little Chance to have more than Negligible Impact, AMOY Nest Failures are Predominately due to Non-human Events. ?for example:

- ? Mammalian Predation: 54% Highest Impact ? Storm / Lunar Tides: 29% ? Nest Abandonment: 6% ? Avian Predation: 5% ? Ghost Crab Predation: 3%
- ? Human Interference: 3% Insignificant Impact

I disagree with how NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem. They did not consider:

- ? Villages, dredge and spoil islands, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge
- ? Dredge and spoil islands typically have fewer predators to threaten nesting birds
- ? Bird activity within neighboring areas should be tracked and included in target productivity levels. Fluctuations and trends in Recreational Area bird populations should be viewed relative to regional and state experiences ?not in isolation.

I agree that all locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem and should have been considered.

I disagree with the NPS: Around the clock closure from nest to surf line (p.125) from May 1 ?November 15th

I agree with a Closure to surf line from 1 hour before sunset until dawn, monitored by Turtle Night Nest Watch Team because Night Driving Restrictions Penalize Pedestrian and ORV users.

I disagree with the NPS barriers 105 meters wide (p.125)

I agree with that "Closure should be 10 meters square during the day"

I disagree with the NPS: Use U shaped light filter fence to orient hatchlings

I agree with a proposed "Use Pea Island style keyhole pattern fence to the surf line at night"

I disagree with NPS that : "ORV and other recreational use would have long-term major adverse impacts on sea turtles due to the amount of Seashore available for ORV use and by allowing nighttime driving on the beach." (p. 377)

I agree with the assessment that "Major Adverse" (NPS definition, p.369) events have not occurred at the Recreational Area ?Night Driving Restrictions are not Necessary because :

- ? Nesting females have not "been killed"
- ? Complete or partial nest lost due to human activity has not "occurred frequently"
- ? Hatchling disorientation/disruption due to humans have not "occurred frequently"
- ? Direct hatchling mortality from human activity has not "frequently occurred"
- ? Pro-active Turtle Night Nest Watch program will insure no ORV impact.

I disagree with the position that NPS will not Adopt More Proactive Techniques Used at Other East Coast Locations to Encourage Turtle Nesting Success.

I agree with the assessment that NPS Inadequately Addresses Environmental Issues More Detrimental to Turtle Recovery Success than ORVs or Pedestrians (p. 392-396) because:

- ? 38.5% of nests had 0% hatchlings due to weather events. (p. 87, p. 219) ? 2009 Loggerhead Recovery Plan calls this catastrophic
- ? False crawl statistics do not support theory that light pollution is a significant problem at the Recreational Area. (p.125, p. 219)
- ? Predator management and nest enclosure practices encourage ghost crabs which are a primary predator of turtle eggs and hatchlings

I disagree with NPS usage of The North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission Relocation Guidelines.

I agree with an assessment that the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission Relocation Guidelines are Inadequate because:

- ? Recreational Area and the State have lost 55% and 60% of Leatherback nests respectively over the past 10 years following these guidelines.
- ? Use of "average high tide line" (as used in other states) rather than "seaward of debris line marking spring high tide" to identify which nests to relocate leave many nests at risk.

I agree with the DEIS descriptions of ORV access as historical in nature (pg. 83) and also both predating the Seashore and as being integral to the public use by both residents and visitors. The document also illustrates and captions historical commercial fishing (pg.18), historical recreational fishing (pgs. 15, 260) and historical general recreational activities (pg. 259). These same traditional cultural activities are featured on the front cover.

I disagree with the NPS failure to appropriately address the traditional cultural value of surf zone access. I disagree because the NPS failure stands in direct violation of its legal responsibility under Section 106 of the NEPA and the NEPA framework as a whole.

I disagree with the socioeconomic data and analyses in the DEIS (pg 270-281;561-598) because it results in misleading and sometimes erroneous conclusions and is directly manifested in both the Effected Environment and Socioeconomic Impact sections. Critical weaknesses in the analyses pertain to:

- 1) statistical definition of the Region of Influence (ROI);
- 2) incomplete visitation/business survey data (p.566);
- 3) erroneous recreational user data;
- 4) inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use;
- 5) flawed key assumption concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F.

These flaws are of the DEIS.

I agree with the definition that ROI incorporation of the Northern Beach communities, including Southern Shores and Duck is misleading. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore

I agree with the opinion that the inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages.

I agree with the opinion that the analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

I agree with the opinion that nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. . I disagree with the management decisions reflected in the DEIS that show a clear bias to implement actions that will adversely affect the visitor experience but to avoid actions that would benefit both natural resources and visitors. For instance:

- ? The NPS says it is OK to replace South Point wetlands with parking area because beach will be closed to ORVs.
- ? The NPS says it is OK to relocate Turtle Nests when storms are imminent, but not before (coincidentally the high risk nests are in prime ORV corridors).
- ? The NPS says it is OK to set aside areas of beach to replant the "extirpated" seabeach amaranth, but not OK to clear vegetation at Cape Point ponds to create more favorable piping plover habitat (outside of the prime ORV corridor).
- ? The NPS says it is OK to kill predators (greatest risk to birds and turtles), not OK to drive on the beach at night (deterrent to predators, low risk to turtles and birds).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 657    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 12:37:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 658    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Amorosi, Joseph  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 12:47:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a visitor to NC, I must say that your parks are truly beautiful. As a surfer I have enjoyed all that NC has to offer in terms of the ocean and its beaches. Automobile access to surf areas by way of the beach is something that must remain. Surfing brings many people to the Cape Hatteras area and the lore of reaching unique surf breaks by beach access keeps people coming back year after year. Taking away automobile access on beaching will diminish the number of tourists/ surfers to the area.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 659    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been visiting cape hatteras since 1974 Camping at either state or public camp grounds and surfing where ever it was breaking best. Beach access is necessary to enjoy Hatteras. Protection from pollution, erosion(unnatural eroision, man induced) and wild life protection are also essential. Blanket bans are unacceptable. Seasonal access limits or restrictions,due to specific animals nesting or mating should be carefully issued and administered. Access to beaches on foot, should be limited to established trails over dunes. Hikers should not braze new trails through fragile dunes. 4wd drive access should also be accomplished only through dedicated access ramps.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come

---

**Correspondence ID:** 660    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 13:59:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have spent many weeks on Hatteras and related islands. I believe the only way to remain an attractive spot for people, is to protect what is there that attracts them in the first place. The use of special vehicles to access remote areas is disruptive and ecologically damaging. A preserve is a preserve, not a vacation hot spot for our entertainment beyond what nature has to offer.  
Limited access allows the contradictory goals of preservation and appreciation to prevail.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 661    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 14:07:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 662    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** callahan, Jared  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** National Park Service:  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
 Perhaps, a potential solution may be to design and implement small networks of protected areas on the beach where habitat for migratory species is known and restrict access in these particular areas year round or temporally when species activity is highest. In addition, providing informational resources on these areas and their importance to coastal ecosystems for the public, if not already provided, may promote public awareness and involvement on this issue.  
 It's important that both environmental and economic effects be considered and while it may seem difficult to satisfy one without detrimentally affecting the other, with a little open mindedness and ingenuity I'm confident an effective and sustainable solution will be made.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 663    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 14:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Restrictive Species Management Area (p. 468) is overly restrictive. ORV driver are very careful not to disrupt the wildlife. We value and appreciate conservative approaches of conservation and DO NOT close the beaches to off road vehicles and fishing. Personally, coming to the beach, riding in our 4x4 and fishing are hallmarks of my vacations for as long as I can remember. My Dad used to bring us. My grand-father used to bring us. I have brought my own children and now they bring my grandchildren. PLEASE do not close the beaches to 4x4 trucks. This is a sleepy little town that makes it's living from tourism. I have developed friendships with many of the business owners and their "way of life" is significantly threatened. Please vote against the closing of the beaches of the Outer Banks. We love it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 664    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Curtis, Brian  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 14:27:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 665    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 14:37:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 666    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 15:09:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I have been visiting Hatteras and the Outer Banks for over ten years. It is where we come together, once a year, to enjoy each other and the beautiful seashore of North Carolina. We have seen quite a bit of development during the past decade and a growing number of summer visitors

(like ourselves). We understand that all of us put increasing pressure on the environment.

I would hope that the Park Service will restrict the using of motorized vehicles throughout the areas it is responsible for. We would like for the land and seascape to remain in the most natural state possible, with the fewest intrusions of vehicles.

Thank you for your interest.

Mark Irwin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 667    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 15:10:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 668    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 15:37:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 669    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Spitzer, Jason  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 15:55:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 670    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 16:59:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 671    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 17:07:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 672    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 17:07:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 673    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 17:37:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 674    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Krawczyk, Greg  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 17:57:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and

preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 675    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 18:07:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 676    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr.25,2010 18:47:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,  
I disagree with the Cape Hatteras DEIS for the following reasons:  
1. The buffer for the nesting piping plovers of 1000 m is unnecessary, and not supported by scientific proof. 200 m is an acceptable distance and used by other National Parks ie Assateague island MD.  
2. I do not agree with not allowing dogs on the beach during nesting. Dogs on a leash pose no threat to nesting birds or turtles.  
3. I do not agree with the DEIS lack of impact to Cape Hatteras socioeonomic status. Under the beach restrictions of the Consent decree local businesses have suffered.All Cape Hatteras has is the beach. There are no golf courses, boardwalks or amusement parks. Severely limiting beach access during the most popular summers seasons will keep people from returning. Cape Hatteras was promised to the people as a recreational area.Communities and businesses developed as a result of that promise and now will be threatened as a results of severely limited beach access.  
4.I agree with management of the seashore but believe that the alternative F is unfair and to restrictive to the people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 677    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area DEIS Comment  
The legislation states: "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area." The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species. Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings. Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted.These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.  
The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime

child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas.

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m  
 MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 678    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25.2010 18:53:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area DEIS Comment

The legislation states: "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area." The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species. Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings. Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas.

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m  
 MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, Jeff

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 19:30:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please continue to do everything in your power to protect our priceless shorebirds and other colonial nesters in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The greatest treasure we can leave our children is an environment in better shape than we found it in.

**Correspondence ID:** 680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 19:37:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 19:47:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 682    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 20:37:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 683    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 20:37:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 684    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 20:37:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 685    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 21:06:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it concerns,  
For over 75 years my family has been travelling to the Outer Banks and Hattaras National seashores. We have always had access to to the beach for fishing and recreational trips that our family has taken. Since the age of 10, I have been included in those trips and we have always been able to have Off Road Access onto the beaches of Oregon Inlet, Hattaras and Ocracoke. Beach access is an important part of our families recreational plans every year during the spring, summer and fall. From National Park Service Camp grounds, private camps, houses and hotels our family brings currently 2 generations of fishing, shopping and 5 to 7 trips per year to this great national seashore. Our recreational money is spent in the local economy and we seek free access to the beaches for our trips. With 3 young kids and fishing gear, we realize the privilege we enjoy by being able to drive on the beach with our 4 wheel drive vehicles.  
We hope that you will work hard to keep our beach access open and work to keep the traditions of beach access and driving on these beaches a priority in any plan created for the Hattaras National seashore.  
Thank you,  
Kevin C. Paulson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 686    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 21:07:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 687    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 21:07:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 688    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 21:08:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 689    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 21:24:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come

---

**Correspondence ID:** 690    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,25,2010 21:37:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 691    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25.2010 21:37:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 692    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25.2010 23:08:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 693    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.25.2010 23:38:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 694    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 02:21:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have visited Cape Hatteras National Seashore many times. The outer banks are a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. I am concerned they will be marred or destroyed by oil exploration, but that is another issue.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly off road vehicle (ORV) use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 695    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wagner, Briana F  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 02:51:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 03:38:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 05:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and

preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

Scott Cox Deerfield Beach Florida

---

**Correspondence ID:** 698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 06:08:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 699    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 06:16:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 700    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 06:38:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 701    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 06:38:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 702    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 06:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kilcomons, Patrick  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 07:04:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fripp, Archibald L  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 07:05:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam, I view with great concern the proposed new plan for beach access on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. My family and I have visited the park multiple times a year for the past forty years. We love the beach and want to maintain its spirit and beauty. As a bird watcher, nature photographer, past member of the Audubon Society, and a concerned citizen, I have supported the temporary plan of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to protect the piping plover even when it meant closing some sections of the beach during breeding and fledging season. However, the proposed plan goes far beyond what I believe is necessary to protect a bird whose population is actually increasing. My primary concerns are as follows:  
 1. The 1,000 meter closure allocated to a piping plover unfledged chick seems excessive. As a citizen I can not support an area larger than a square mile for one nest. The 300 meter restriction for the oyster catcher, a bird that is not threatened, also seems excessive. 2. Pets, including dogs on leashes, will not be permitted on the beach between March 15 and July 31. I know that pets can harm ground nesting birds but not when they are leashed. This ruling will impact use of the beach without doing anything to help the birds. 3. Large sections of the beach will be closed to even pedestrians during the March 15 and July 31 period. This seems excessive. 4. Off road vehicles will be prohibited year round at the Hatteras and Ocracoke Inlet areas. This too seems excessive. I believe that it is important to protect wildlife, but I also believe that such protection must be viewed as rational by the general population such that the political body will continue to support it. Thank you, Archibald L. Fripp, PhD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 07:25:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the piping plover brood requirement of 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions and the 300 meter American Oystercatcher that is not a federally threatened species. Clearly there is room for everyone and every species on this island without these severe restrictions. Reasonable alternatives should be considered that are fair to both the people and the wildlife that occupy on this island.  
 I disagree with the rule in Alternative "F" concerning pets on the beaches on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I believe that pets should be allowed on the beach on leashes during peak hours and allowed to run freely off hours while being observed by their owners as to not offend any other people or wildlife on the beaches. Pet owners can be educated with respect to the environment.  
 I strongly disagree with Alternative "F" concerning ORV's being prohibited year round between ramps 23 and 27 and with the restrictions on night driving between May 1 and November 15th. I have fished these beaches all of my life and I have respected the environment always. This would be a personal loss for both myself and my family and I would consider moving from the island if this occurs. This is a National Park and to restrict it to this degree is quite simply not fair to anyone. The areas noted on p.121 that are targeted for restriction between March 15th and July 31st are some of the most beautiful places on the island. I have spent countless days with friends and family there. Please find a reasonable alternative.  
 One last note. I found very little information in Alternative "F" concerning the preservation of the cultural resources which I consider a very important issue that deserves more attention than this report provided.  
 Thank you,  
 Timothy J Cantwell

**Correspondence ID:** 706 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 07:38:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 707 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been visiting Cape Hatteras National Seashore for many years. I have been all over the east coast and consider it one of the most pristine and valuable parks on the east coast. It holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. Being born and raised in a beach town, I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 708 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sheridan, Scott M  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 07:41:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 709 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 07:43:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 710 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 07:58:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My first surfing trip was to the outer Banks in 1985. I was not even old enough to drive, an older person took me, a friend, and his own kids. I've been back many times since, camping, renting hotel rooms, and houses and just enjoying all the Outer Banks has to offer. I'll be back one day soon with my own kids...hopefully.  
I support a balanced option that recognizes the economy of the Outer Banks depends on people coming to visit to surf and fish. Alternative "C" best represents that viewpoint.  
While I am not an ORV enthusiast myself, I typically travel to the Outer Banks with people owning such vehicles. I frankly could not imagine a trip there without the luxury of driving down the beach a bit to find an area a surf break to ourselves. it just would not be the same Outer Banks to me.  
In the intervening years since that first trip in 1985, I spent a summer working for the US Fish and Wildlife Service in Assateague Island, Virginia. My

0008938

duties included endangered bird surveys, and explaining to Refuge visitors about the habits of and the importance of birds like Piping Plovers. Most importantly I would convey how human activity disturbed these birds.  
I continue these practices in my daily life in coastal NJ, making sure humans understand their impact and doing what is possible to protect Plovers from Sandy Hook to Sea Girt, NJ.  
I understand it is just easier for you to say "No" in order to protect birds. But the National Park Service is in the business of protecting wild areas for the enjoyment and recreation of visitors. It is a National Wildlife Refuge where wildlife is to be preserved at all costs. Trust me I know the difference because Assateague has both on the same island.  
Please balance recreational use with bird protection. I have been following this in the news from afar and it seems up until now the recreational users have not been properly represented and the bird lovers have had an undue influence on the process.  
John Weber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 711    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:01:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I just wanted to send you a note that I understand and appreciate your desire to protect an in important and vital ecosystem in your efforts to close off Cape Hatteras from off road vehicles. I only hope that you will be thoughtful and considerate of the human interests as they pertain to this eco system as well and allow reasonalbe access to the beaches. If not, many of them will become useless to those who pay taxes to support it.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 712    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:04:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 713    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:08:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 714    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:15:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 715    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:25:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 716    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:26:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No further regulations or restrictions are needed for access to our coastal fishing and recreation areas. Please cease further attempts to take away our freedoms by government infringement. Why not stick to the authorities given to the Government by the Constitution, for a change?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hatcher, Dr Tim G  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:27:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I implore you to NOT restrict access by people or ORV's to ANY CHNS beach areas. As a social scientist I can speak knowledgeably and empirically to the negative impact such restrictions will have not only to local but regional economies and cultures. As a participant in the recent Sea Grant Charter Fishing Economic Impact Study it was proven that charter fishing ALONE brings in millions of dollars of revenue annually to North Carolina. Beach restrictions would adversely impact this critical industry already reeling from a recession. And this is only ONE example. There is absolutely no doubt that restrictions will significantly curtail tourism, the primary source of income for the entire NC coastal region. Such restrictions made on invalid or at least questionable science provided by groups who have little real human/visceral investment in the NC coast will not solve the ecological concerns that ALL citizens and residents of the region already have. The assumption seems to be that local residents do not care about the ecology; nothing could be further from the truth. Sustainability means ensuring future generations have an environment and conditions that enhance their lives. To make a choice to restrict access to the beaches completely ignores the fact that people just the same as birds, turtles and fish are a part of the ecosystem and if their livelihoods and cultural identities are taken then there will be no culture, and thus no people/humans in the future to benefit from that sustainability. In a democracy, ALL impacted and concerned voices must be heard, and reasonable and accountable actions taken as a result of actually listening to such voices. If restrictions are implemented as a result of the political pressures of biased and powerful groups with little or no resident members and no cultural ownership versus citizens who have cultural roots, a highly vested interest in conservation and absolute reliance on the NC coast for basic survival then the NPS will be DIRECTLY responsible for thousands of people losing jobs, incomes, housing, cultural roots and any chance of a sustainable future where people and the environment can co-exist. The outcome will be devastating. Ironically, the result also includes having no reason for an NPS.  
Dr Tim Hatcher

---

**Correspondence ID:** 718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:29:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect many things, including migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
Limiting access of ORV according to migration patterns of local treasured species, and requiring a license system for ORV are reasonable requirements that would allow the public to share in the responsibility of caring for the beach we love. Fishing licenses and permits for fires are good models already in place, and a similar solution can manage ORV access.  
I strongly support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:42:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow these destructive vehicles on the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 08:45:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Christie, Brandon N  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 09:02:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Murray:  
 ORV use/access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CHNS) is important to all visitors of the CHNS. The reason it is so appealing is it allows visitors to access remote parts of the Park to enjoy, fishing, bird watching, surfing, sun bathing and many more activities. Access to these remote areas, wilderness, is what is appealing to CHNS. No other place on earth offers beach access and with it the feeling of freedom and remoteness. The beauty of south point on Ocracoke along with the history that goes with it can not be enjoyed from Highway 12. Hatteras Inlet can not be enjoyed from the parking lot at Ramp 55. The best surf fishing spot in the world, Cape Point, can not be enjoyed by Park visitors if it is closed during the Spring and Summer.  
 The need for action is understandable. With visitors increasing yearly an ORV management plan is necessary for park management. In the past I think you could see that visitors to the park acted responsibly. There were violations but I think statistics will prove that vehicle operation in the park was for the most part done responsibly. When people visit a National Park it is inherit to act responsible to both the Park and the wildlife in the Park. The fact that this land was set aside by your Fore Fathers creates a sense of responsibility to preserve this land.  
 What is not understandable is how the ORV management plan process has been forced upon all sides by one group. The group that is for the greatest restrictions has used their leverage to get what they want. Lawsuits and inconsistent science seems to dominate their efforts. Park access should not be limited based on threats and smoke and mirrors.  
 1. A Piping Plover or Oyster Catcher can nest on Cape Point and you close a large section of the beach but when they nest next the highway nothing is done? Why the closure then? 2. How come some animals can be killed to protect others? 3. What if raccoon or fox advocate groups wanted to visit the park and they found that their favorite species to watch was being killed to protect another group's favorite species?  
 Alternative F seems to be a plan based on compromise. As long as the SMAs do not get out of control and create large unnecessary closures I think the plan will work. Whatever plan is selected I hope it will be a logical one. Common Sense based on reality should rule the plan. Educating ORV operators should be a priority. Keep beach access a top priority for the people to enjoy the park and for the people who live on Hatteras Island and Ocracoke. Please do not implement a restrictive plan based on the inconsistent issues of one group with an agenda to limit access.  
 Sincerely,  
 Brandon Christie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 09:15:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a coastal NC resident, and a regular visitor to the Outer Banks (and Core Banks). I value our local ecosystem, our national natural resources, and the ability of our citizens and visitors to enjoy both.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if

not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

Sincerely,  
Ben Whitlock

---

**Correspondence ID:** 724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 09:45:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lang, Pete  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with any alternative that predetermines restricted areas for ORV/pedestrian access without considering actual nesting within those areas each year. Pg (i) ? I disagree with the characterization that ORV for recreational purposes only resulted in the last half century due to increased accessibility to the barrier islands; that generalization can be made for beach recreation as a whole. Pg (i) ? I disagree that there has been "a decline in most beach nesting bird populations on the Seashore since the 1990's." There is no data to support this vague generalization. Pg (ii) ? I disagree with the stated purpose of DEIS to manage ORV use/access, as the alternatives also regulate pedestrian access and pet use. This DEIS seeks to restrict and regulate all human related access and interaction with nesting species along the Seashore. Pg (ii) ? I disagree this DEIS studied, considered, or otherwise addressed the stated purpose to protect and preserve "cultural resources." There are less than 2 pages of this document referencing cultural resources or protecting human inhabitant's use of the natural resources. Pg 55 ? I disagree that Alternative F included input from the Advisory Committee. I disagree with Alt D in its entirety as it seeks to almost complete restrict or eliminate ORV access. I disagree with any pedestrian restriction greater than 30 meters from a nesting or unfledged species within non-wildlife "village" beaches or waterfront areas. I disagree with ORV or pedestrian buffer zones for non-threatened or otherwise not protected species (pg 121-127). Pg 136 ? I disagree with Alt F where it prohibits pets in the Seashore including in the front of villages. Pg 136 ? I disagree with the finding that Alt A will lead to long term moderate to major adverse impacts, first that it neglects to recognize elements of the 1978 Draft Interim Plan included in this alternative provide buffers and restrictions, and second that while in affect the many species including non-indigenous ones thrived.  
As a visitor to the NC Seashore for the last 30 years and a current Hatteras Island home owner I hope the NPS and involved parties can implement a rational beach and shoreline use plan that does not overtly prohibit ORV, pedestrian, or monitored pet access which makes this such a unique and enjoyable region. I suggest that any plan include continued data collection to analyze how ORV or pedestrian traffic directly impact nesting species compared to other natural adverse occurrences. Further, that data should be compared to other regions to the north and south, which have limited to no access and no significant human involvement to promote the breeding of so many species. Consider many identified species successfully nest and fledge within populated village areas without the use of buffer zones, and that prohibiting access or use in many of the popular natural areas is needlessly punitive to residents and visitors. Finally, consider that there is little or no evidence that current or increased ORV/pedestrian restrictions will further promote protected species, which have thrived during the last 30 plus years under the interim plan.  
Please keep ORV, pedestrian, and monitored pet access open to the park beaches and shoreline in the spirit of the 1978 Draft Interim Plan so that humans and wildlife can all enjoy it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lang, Monica  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with any alternative that predetermines restricted areas for ORV/pedestrian access without considering actual nesting within those areas each year. Pg (i) ? I disagree with the characterization that ORV for recreational purposes only resulted in the last half century due to increased accessibility to the barrier islands; that generalization can be made for beach recreation as a whole. Pg (i) ? I disagree that there has been "a decline in most beach nesting bird populations on the Seashore since the 1990's." There is no data to support this vague generalization. Pg (ii) ? I disagree with the stated purpose of DEIS to manage ORV use/access, as the alternatives also regulate pedestrian access and pet use. This DEIS seeks to restrict and regulate all human related access and interaction with nesting species along the Seashore. Pg (ii) ? I disagree this DEIS studied, considered, or otherwise addressed the stated purpose to protect and preserve "cultural resources." There are less than 2 pages of this document referencing cultural resources or protecting human inhabitant's use of the natural resources. Pg 55 ? I disagree that Alternative F included input from the Advisory Committee. I disagree with Alt D in its entirety as it seeks to almost complete restrict or eliminate ORV access. I disagree with any pedestrian restriction greater than 30 meters from a nesting or unfledged species within non-wildlife "village" beaches or waterfront areas. I disagree with ORV or pedestrian buffer zones for non-threatened or otherwise not protected species (pg 121-127). Pg 136 ? I disagree with Alt F where it prohibits pets in the Seashore including in the front of villages. Pg 136 ? I disagree with the finding that Alt A will lead to long term moderate to major adverse impacts, first that it neglects to recognize elements of the 1978 Draft Interim Plan included in this alternative provide buffers and restrictions, and second that while in affect the many species

including non-indigenous ones thrived.

As a visitor to the NC Seashore for the last 25 years and a current Hatteras Island home owner I hope the NPS and involved parties can implement a rational beach and shoreline use plan that does not overtly prohibit ORV, pedestrian, or monitored pet access which makes this such a unique and enjoyable region. I suggest that any plan include continued data collection to analyze how ORV or pedestrian traffic directly impact nesting species compared to other natural adverse occurrences. Further, that data should be compared to other regions to the north and south, which have limited to no access and no significant human involvement to promote the breeding of so many species. Consider many identified species successfully nest and fledge within populated village areas without the use of buffer zones, and that prohibiting access or use in many of the popular natural areas is needlessly punitive to residents and visitors. Finally, consider that there is little or no evidence that current or increased ORV/pedestrian restrictions will further promote protected species, which have thrived during the last 30 plus years under the interim plan.

Please keep ORV, pedestrian, and monitored pet access open to the park beaches and shoreline in the spirit of the 1978 Draft Interim Plan so that humans and wildlife can all enjoy it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 727    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 10:12:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a long time visitor to the outer bank of NC and find that the real beauty of the banks is being taken away from the very people who pay the bill for the federal parks, the tax payer. We love this area because of the way everybody that drives on the beach take care of the it and clean up any mess they find. The very beautiful miles of beach, the wildlife, the swimming, fishing and the idea that we can get away from the hotel area and the noise. As a person that sends as much time as I can out doors this area is god gift. I have never seen a person that tries to kill the wildlife here and can not believe that a answer with the park service can not be worked out. PLEASE stop the few steal this treasure from us that love and respect the outer banks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 728    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 10:15:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 729    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 10:15:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 730    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 10:15:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 731 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,26,2010 10:27:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 732 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,26,2010 10:29:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First of all, I must say that this document is ridiculously long, and repeats itself in many places. It is extremely difficult to read through in any kind of timely manner. I have been very disappointed with the performance of the NPS in regards to ORV usage on the CHNS, beginning with their mismanagement of the ORV usage plan following the original executive order.

As far as the new management plan goes, I would like to see a combination of alternatives that have been presented added to alternative F. Foremost, I would like to see the permit system implemented as soon as possible, with the proceeds being split between ORV trail maintenance and education, and wildlife habitat maintenance. I believe that the carrying capacity restrictions are extremely unrealistic, however, especially when it comes to enforcement issues. There are simply too many beach access points, and it would require too many NPS personnel to monitor beach usage. The only place I have seen this work is at the Assateague N.S., but they have only one beach access point. Assateague has also been successful at putting ORV permit money back into seashore improvements. They provide free air for tires, and an overnight on-beach parking area with trash removal for fisherman.

Trail maintenance would also help to alleviate one of the major concerns of ORV users leaving designated roads to avoid standing water. The majority of standing water problems I have witnessed are the result of ruts and large depressions (sometimes filled over 1 foot deep with water) caused by a lack of trail maintenance. Users simply cannot risk getting stuck in these remote areas of beach trail. The areas I have specifically witnessed are the trails that access Hatteras inlet, and sound-side trails on Ocracoke. I have also seen several ramps, including the popular one leading out to Cape Point, become virtually impassable either due to ruts or soft sand conditions that could have been controlled by NPS if they had a trail maintenance budget.

I would also like to add that ORV issues on the CHNS are not like ORV issues experienced by other national parks. Most of those issues are caused by irresponsible recreational users. On Cape Hatteras, ORV use is simply a transportation issue. Very few people are simply joyriding on the beach. Most are using their vehicles to get to a fishing spot, or to find a place to sunbathe. ATVs should absolutely remain prohibited. The permit system would help to discourage casual users, and hopefully reduce seasonal beach traffic.

I agree the beach permit should have an educational element to it. This element should be in the form of a pamphlet guide outlining safe and preferred beach driving procedures. These procedures should encourage using existing track sets on the upper and/or lower beach, encouraging drivers to remain off the middle section of beach as much as possible. This would hopefully allow for increased numbers of ghost crabs to have safe, livable beach habitat, and would also improve the aesthetic value of the beach in general. Assateague is a good example of this. Wide areas of beach have few tracks in the middle.

Some forms of recreation are simply going to have priority over others. Fishing should be at the top of the list. Users wishing a pristine environment, or excellent bird-watching opportunities can go to Pea Island or the Alligator River NWRs. Night-sky star-gazers have a myriad of possible viewing locations that do not involve the CHNS, and should not even be listed on the EIS. Fishermen and hunters have always been this country's first line of defense for natural resources, and we will continue to be so. Tax dollars from our equipment goes directly into state and federal wildlife habitat programs. The other users cannot boast this, and in fact when similar taxes were proposed for their recreational equipment, they were shot down.

Finally, the punitive system for nesting area tampering needs to end immediately. The enclosure spaces are derived from scientific data, yet when one of the sites has a sign knocked down, NPS imposes a punitive size increase that is completely arbitrary, and in fact favors the anti-ORV use activists. Would a fisherman be foolish enough to damage one of these areas knowing that the size of the beach closure would be increased? Of course not. I know I would report anyone I saw immediately, as would other fishermen. This policy is simply ridiculous, and shows a lack of understanding by NPS personnel.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 733 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Newhard, Jim

**Received:** Apr,26,2010 10:34:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an OVR beach fisherman my comments are as follows:

1) the 1000 meter radius around a bird nest is excessive. That closes a mile of beach. There are many places along the outer banks that aren't even a mile

wide between the ocean and the sound. Will Rt.12 be closed? I believe a more realistic number, say 100 meters, which still gives the birds 2 football fields, is sufficient. Is there scientific fact that shows the 1 mile circle is required? Also, if a piping plover nested in a planter in a McDonalds parking lot would the 1000 meter radius be enforced? I think not.

2) No pets. I don't currently own a pet but have taken my dog to the beach in Delaware in the past. We have the 6 foot leash rule. Dogs must be kept on a 6 foot leash. As long as this rule is enforced it should keep the wildlife safe. No need to establish new laws, just enforce the current ones.

3) Is there proof that seasonal beach closings help the bird population? Delaware has seasonally closed parts of Cape Henlopen State Park for more than a decade with no improvement of bird populations. More bird nests are destroyed by storms and predation than by ORV's. Again, are these beach closings backed by fact or are they asked for on the whim of special interest groups.

In closing I would like to say that myself and my family have been vacationing in the outer banks for 25+ years, myself 2 or 3 times a summer. My son will continue this with his family. Future generations will follow. I would hope that they will be able to enjoy the beaches with the same rights that I have. If these rights are taken away there will be no reason for us to vacation in the outer banks thereby the economy will be losing several thousands of dollars in beach house rental, fuel, grocery spending, bait and tackle purchases, not to mention fishing licenses. I just ask that you look at the proposal fairly and from both sides and make a decision based on facts.

Thank you.  
Jim Newhard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 734    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 10:50:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I have enjoyed the Cape Hatteras Recreation Area for over 40 years usually visiting 2 to 3 times a year. We enjoy surf fishing and the pristine natural environment.  
We are always careful to observe National Park Service signs rules and always leave the area we visited cleaner and more litter free than when we arrived.  
Cape Hatteras is a national treasure enjoyed by many thousands who spend time and money on the Outer Banks.  
We believe that the greatest threat to protected birds is from natural predators and from the natural environment, not from visitors.  
It is unthinkable that the Recreation Area (as originally named) would be banned or severely restricted to human use in order to protect protected, but not endangered- birds who are thriving on Cora June Island and in other un-regulated locations.  
We believe that the Consent Decree was crammed down the throats of Dare County and the residents. It was consented to only with the fear that a total ban on beach access could be the Courts alternative. It was the lesser of two evils.  
We do not object to reasonable permitting requirements for ORV's and to closures for turtle nesting protection.  
Prime surf fishing recreation areas should be protected for the taxpayers use - Cape Hatteras, Ocracoke and Pea Island are treasures and the public's use must never be denied.  
There is a compromise position allowing protection of bird nesting areas while allowing ORV access for fishing, bathing etc.  
Please work to find the compromise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 735    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Finley, George b  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** On page 1994 there is reference to a Joanna Burger paper on feeding habits of the Pipping Plover when pedestrians are present and when they are not. That data was collected during two minutes of observation and should not be relied on for any purpose. I have been on beaches with Burger's interns when after 3 months of observation they still did not know where the un- hatched nest were located, not a clue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 736    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Finley, George b  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 11:13:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility

---

**Correspondence ID:** 737    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Finley, George b  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 11:16:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with closing beaches to pets, horses should be included.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 738    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 11:22:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 739    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fox, Raymond G  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 11:36:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	740	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Antoon, Jay				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,26,2010 11:47:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There is a better balance for all parties. This is degrading to read as an American citizen.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	741	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Cynthia, Hichens W				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,26,2010 11:53:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>By choice, we do not own a 4-wheel drive vehicle, but we walk the beach nearly every day. Several years ago during one such excursion, we were about to enter a vehicle corridor on Ocracoke's south point when we were stopped by a wildlife official. As a Ford Expedition rumbled through the corridor, she tried to explain how two retirees on foot were more disruptive to the environment than a mini-tank. That position made no sense then, nor does it make sense now, and it cannot possibly be supported scientifically.</p> <p>Ocracoke is vastly different from Buxton, Avon, Kitty Hawk, Corolla or Duck. The plan notes that the new restrictions would have some impact on small businesses. Ocracoke has nothing but small businesses. It never will have a Walmart, Lowe's, Target or McDonald's.</p> <p>What you enact now will affect every aspect of village life here. Please consider carefully before trying to make regulations that apply equally to the entire Outer Banks. They never will be equal.</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	742	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Lizer, Deja				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,26,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.</p> <p>Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.</p> <p>I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.</p> <p>Thank you</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	743	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	OConnell, Evan T				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,26,2010 12:02:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including kite boarding, surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.</p> <p>I am an avid kiteboarder who works for a kiting company and is moving to Cape hatteras pretty much for this reason. It is such a beautiful amazing spot for everything, including kiteboarding and the access to the beaches.</p> <p>I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	744	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,26,2010 12:26:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>There has been alot of noise over the past few years about driving on the beach on the outer banks. My understanding is that it is because of birds and turtles that nest there. Fishing, which involves driving on the beach, is the very thing that makes the outer banks attractive to most people. It is one of the few places on this planet that is still as it was hundreds of , maybe thousands of years ago. The government has taken away most of the freedom that our forfathers fought to maintain since the moment they stepped on to this contenient. this is another example. I would like for my children and thiers to be able to enjoy what little bit of gods country is left.</p> <p>I don't really understand how places like ocracoke and cape lookout will stay in business if driving on the beach is restricted because of some bird watchers. I don't know maybe it is the rich who keep this place alive and not the comman folk who like to fish. I have been going to the outer banks ever since I have learned about it. I spend somewhere in the area of 4-6k every year down there either with my buddies fishing or with my family and I can tell you now that if it wasn't for the surf fishing, driving on the beach, I can find better places to spend my money. When you start screwing the very people who keep your businesses alive, the fisherman, you are asking for trouble.</p> <p>Most likely this change will take place and you will slowly squeeze the breath out of the small business man who is tring to survive, then the rich people can watch all the birds and turtles they want to. By the way I have never seen any dead turtle on the beach that were run over by a vehicle and I have never seen anyone chasing birds. A matter of fact all the people I know that fish down there frown upon this type of activity.</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	745	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Ratcliff, Philip J				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,26,2010 13:03:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm all in favor of protecting sensitive areas at the Cape.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	746	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,26,2010 13:07:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 747    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Myers, Steve  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 13:08:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It seems to me if there was an issue with human activity and animals (birds,turtles) on the outer banks of NC we would have seen a huge impact years ago. What we are seeing is inconsistent reports of to the good or bad; this is not enough data to make a good judgement call to change anything from the way it has been for years. Please do not let money or politics persuade this judgement, we all have seen these decision made to many times and we have all been hurt from poor judgements. Real longterm data and possibly a fieldtrip for the ones who make the final decision would be the best way come to a correct decision. Our ancestors worked very hard to bring wonderful things to us and it only takes a few seconds to tear it down.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 748    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 13:16:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 749    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lovell, Stewart  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 13:24:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been a visitor to the Cape Hatteras Seashore for 37 years and have witnessed the changes that have come with beach access. To visitors and residents alike, these changes are unnecessary and unfair.

The beach access under the Consent Decree is too restrictive. The NPS preferred alternative essentially mimics the current rules, and would be too restrictive as well. For other alternatives all access to the most popular and attractive locations on the Seashore would be denied. When the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area was created the federal government made certain pledges. The government intended the Seashore to be for the enjoyment of people, and pledged that beach access would be maintained at customary levels. Access has been steadily eroded over the years, mile after mile banned or limited, and the public's enjoyment has suffered. My enjoyment has suffered. This is a violation of the government's pledge. NPS's preferred alternative "F" would continue this ongoing violation of the public trust, spoiling the intent of Congress.

The enabling legislation did not intend for the principal function of the Seashore to be its value as a wildlife preserve. The Seashore was preserved for recreation. There are many other areas on the outer banks that serve refuge functions, as intended by the government.

One example of bias in the DEIS is the title of alternative "D", "Increased Predictability". This is quite deceitful. It is not an advantage for the public to easily know they will be consistently excluded from all SMAs forever. It should be titled "Most Restrictive", because that is what it is.

I note there is no compelling evidence in the DEIS or elsewhere that shows that the current or proposed restrictions are having or would have any beneficial effect for the species. I also note no evidence exists proving an adverse impact of humans on the species. Natural forces and conditions on the Seashore, such as predation, storms, and suitable habitat, are the determinant of success or failure for species of concern, not humans. The DEIS is supposed to provide best available science but it does not. This violates NEPA requirements.

There is, however, absolutely no doubt that the restrictions are having a negative effect on people by reducing their enjoyment of the Seashore. This has had direct adverse socio-economic impacts in the surrounding communities. Significant loss of tourism business on which the Seashore villages depend for the very livelihood has occurred. These are measured impacts but they are not properly documented in the DEIS.

I object to the existing restrictions and the adoption of any restrictions that would deny even more access. Species protection in the days prior to the Consent Decree was fair and adequate. The degree of access the public enjoyed needs to be restored.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 750    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Robinson, Leanne F  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 14:03:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in Hatteras my whole life. My entire families well-being and livelyhood depends entirely on tourism, fishing and surfing. Since I was a teenager I have been driving my jeep down the beach at ramp 55 daily to surf and enjoy the gifts that were given to me for livng on such a beautiful island. I don't expect a decision to be made based on surfing and my love of our secluded beaches, but I truly believe that if too much regulation is passed considering beach driving the economy of this island and our surrounding communities will get so bad most locals will be forced to move away. It's understandable to protect the wildlife but not to the extent where it's ruining PEOPLE's lives. Closing too many beaches will deplete the tourism

enough that my business will be ruined and everyone else in my family will not only have to find new jobs but will also have to live in places and ways different than they have spent their entire lives. Hatteras's economy depends solely on tourists who love to fish, surf and just enjoy the oceans beauty. If too many beaches are closed to the public it will cause a domino effect starting with visitors not wanting to drive the distance to Hatteras simply to have the same pleasures as Nags Head and Wilmington and other NC beaches. The unique part that brings people all the way to Hatteras is the immense amount of secluded coastline that they can pull right up to. When they stay north in town because they can't do this anymore the fishermen will make less money. The restaurants and hotels and real estate companies will struggle and this will force many natives to relocate or live a hard life of poverty. IT saddens me that the treasures that make someone like me and so many others love this place are being threatened to be taken from us for issues that are uncertain. My main question is what would be worse for everyone: If things were left the way it has always been in this situation or if all the beaches were shut down? To me the answer is clear as day....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 751    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Dwiggins, Chris  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 14:11:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the proposed legislation that is pushing to close the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I understand the need to look out after nature and to try preserve the habitat that surrounds these animals, but I can't quite understand how by saving these animals we help those who call this area home? The residents of the Seashore have invested their lives by producing and providing the supplies necessary for tourist, fishermen, fisherwomen, family members and so on to visit this great Seashore. By taking away the access to the beach for these visitors will impact the economy of the Outer Banks to the point of desertion. I feel that no one will be able to sustain their lively hood or be able to provide for their families in the way they currently are use to.

I believe that people who are passionate about issues and causes fail to see the other side that is effected. We create blinders and only focus on the goal of which we feel is the best choice. Preserving the environment is important, but not at the expense of peoples' lives. Should there be restriction and preservation, yes there should, but not at the expense of the citizens of the Seashore. Compromise and come up with a solution that benefits both parties. There will be some giving and taking on issues however a solution should be the focus.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 752    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 14:16:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 753    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Glover, Jessie L  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 14:19:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There is no reason that the Seashore Villages/visitors, and wildlife can't live together in harmony. The traditional cultural importance of the surf zone access to Outer Banks Seashore Villages/visitors is just as important as the sanctuary for the wildlife. Both have been done together for decades without interference, or detriment to either. But the fact is, the greatest impact of these closures is to the human's cultural experience, the economy, and the way of life. Those 3 greatly out-weigh the immeasurable affect on wildlife. And I say immeasurable because the numbers show that there has not been a positive affect on the wildlife under the consent decree. Therefore, I am for keeping the ORV/pedestrian access to the beaches open.

Human's Cultural Experience:

? NPS Guidelines state; "A Traditional Cultural Property designation can and should be based on patterns of land use that reflect cultural traditions valued by the long term residents of the local community."

? NPS Guidelines state: "A landscape can also constitute Traditional Cultural Property if it is a location where a community has traditionally carried out economic or other cultural practices important in maintaining its historic identity."

? The DEIS describes ORV access as historical in nature (pg.83) and also both predating the Seashore and as being integral to the public use by both residents and visitors. The document also illustrates and captions historical commercial fishing (pg. 18), historical recreational fishing (pgs. 15, 260) and historical general recreational activities (pg. 259).

? The surf zone has long been not just a location for traditional economic activities, but also cultural activities as well. Collectively these activities are components of an unbroken pattern of land use that extend back many generations before the establishment of the Seashore and remain integral to the fabric of the historically unique Outer Banks communities.

Economy:

? It is clear that the socioeconomic impact on the Seashore villages due to beach closures for ORV and pedestrians will be great. The DEIS, has inaccurately analyzed the data (pg 270-281; 561-598) which results in misleading and sometimes erroneous conclusions. As per the DEIS:

\* The ROI (Region of Influence) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected for ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. Therefore they should not be included in the data.

\* Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in the analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact of Seashore Villages.

\* Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in the DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

\* It is clear that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages. The DEIS shows only the

overall economics interests within the greater ROI.

\* Economic analysis in the DEIS do not use data from the first full year of the Consent Decree (2009).

\* Many 2008 visitors were either unaware of the scope and breadth of the Consent Decree beach closures, or had already made plans/reservations (I was one of them).

\* Actual business survey data rather than model projections for economic impact for Seashore Villages businesses are not available in the DEIS.

\* Overall visitor counts include a large percentage of visitors who vacation in the Northern Beach communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore

\* Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brother's National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Currently they are included in the visitor counts.

Way of Life:

? On August 17th, 1937, an Act of Congress establishes the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to provide recreational access to the general public.

? On June 29th, 1940, Congress amends the enabling legislation and the words "Recreational Area" are added to further emphasize the recreational nature of the seashore as a destination for beachgoers and fisherman.

? The people of Hatteras Island have repeatedly been promised access and guaranteed use of the recreational area. In 1953, U.S. Department of Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman issued an order directing the acquired land to be "administered, protected, and developed by the National Park Service for National Seashore recreational purposes for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

? Many local residents remember the solemn promise made by former Park Service Director, Conrad Wirth. In an open letter to the people of the Outer Banks, Wirth assured, "There will always be access to the beach for all people, whether they are local residents or visitors." He gave his word to the people of Hatteras that access to the beaches would never be denied in creating this new recreational area.

? NPS has stated; "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Seashore and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." (pg 1)

? Pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment.

**Correspondence ID:** 754    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** WOLFE, ANNA M  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 14:31:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
 Please also consider attending one of the upcoming hearings so that your voice can be heard on this issue.  
 PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULE click for details:  
 Ocracoke, NC - Monday, April 26, 2010, 9:00 am to 11:00 am Buxton, NC - Monday, April 26, 2010, 5:00 pm to 8:00 pm Kill Devil Hills, NC - Tuesday, April 27, 2010, 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm Raleigh, NC - Wednesday, April 28, 2010, 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm Hampton, VA - Thursday, April 29, 2010, 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm  
 Outer Banks Chapter Statement on ORV Access in Cape Hatteras  
 The Outer Banks Chapter of the Surfrider Foundation recognizes the unique ecological, recreational and economic value of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We further recognize that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. We understand that for decades the Park Service has allowed access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches by Off Road Vehicles (ORV) with minimal restriction or oversight and that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. The Outer Banks Chapter supports beach preservation and protection efforts, but feel that a temporary and or permanent ban on ORV access to these beaches could have an immediate detrimental impact on the Outer Banks economy, and severely limit public access to groups that appreciate, use, and support the protection of these coastal resources. We believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved.  
 It is difficult for one that has not spent significant time on the Outer Banks to consider how limited access to beaches would become without ORV use, access that is the very reason that people from all over the world come to the Outer Banks to visit. In our small community where much of the oceanfront has been developed by homes, this small stretch of National Park is truly one of the last protected places to enjoy the unique resources on Hatteras Island. Hatteras Island offers world class surfing and fishing, much of which can be attributed to its remote location that is accessible only by ORV's. At this time the Outer Banks Chapter of Surfrider Foundation believes that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 The Outer Banks Chapter implores all parties involved in this issue to find a balance between access, protection and preservation. We recommend managing access of these areas through a combination of permitting, limiting the number of vehicles, and closures when necessary to protect the migratory species that use this area seasonally. The Outer Banks Chapter of Surfrider Foundation supports protection and preservation, and in this unique situation does support the reasonable use of ORVs to allow public access to this area.

**Correspondence ID:** 755    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Spraggins, C  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 14:32:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a property owner in Frisco and a frequent visitor to Hatteras Island, I am deeply troubled by proposed restrictions that will place an undue economic burden on property owners and local businesses alike. The socioeconomic impact has been disregarded in favor of narrow environmental concerns. I implore all involved in this decision to seek a more suitable compromise that takes into account the viewpoints of all.  
 Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 756    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 14:33:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a unique place, one like no other in the country. I have enjoyed the National Seashore in and around Cape Hatteras for years and I believe access is one of the things that makes Cape Hatteras unique for visitors from all over the country. I have 25 or so friends that have all at some point in their life taken at least one trip to Cape Hatteras and being able to access the unspoiled National Seashore is a big part of what keeps them going back again and again. It would be a shame to deny access for future generations. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area. We must find a balance that will keep Cape Hatteras economically viable for the residents and businesses while at the same time preserving it for future generations.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 757    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lipsett, Skip  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 14:46:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a visitor to the Cape Hatteras Seashore for 39 years and have witnessed the changes that have come with beach access. To visitors and residents alike, these changes are unnecessary and unfair.  
The beach access under the Consent Decree is too restrictive. The NPS preferred alternative essentially mimics the current rules, and would be too restrictive as well. For other alternatives all access to the most popular and attractive locations on the Seashore would be denied. When the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area was created the federal government made certain pledges. The government intended the Seashore to be for the enjoyment of people, and pledged that beach access would be maintained at customary levels. Access has been steadily eroded over the years, mile after mile banned or limited, and the public's enjoyment has suffered. My enjoyment has suffered. This is a violation of the government's pledge. NPS's preferred alternative "F" would continue this ongoing violation of the public trust, spoiling the intent of Congress.  
The enabling legislation did not intend for the principal function of the Seashore to be its value as a wildlife preserve. The Seashore was preserved for recreation. There are many other areas on the outer banks that serve refuge functions, as intended by the government.  
One example of bias in the DEIS is the title of alternative "D", "Increased Predictability". This is quite deceitful. It is not an advantage for the public to easily know they will be consistently excluded from all SMAs forever. It should be titled "Most Restrictive", because that is what it is.  
I note there is no compelling evidence in the DEIS or elsewhere that shows that the current or proposed restrictions are having or would have any beneficial effect for the species. I also note no evidence exists proving an adverse impact of humans on the species. Natural forces and conditions on the Seashore, such as predation, storms, and suitable habitat, are the determinant of success or failure for species of concern, not humans. The DEIS is supposed to provide best available science but it does not. This violates NEPA requirements.  
There is, however, absolutely no doubt that the restrictions are having a negative effect on people by reducing their enjoyment of the Seashore. This has had direct adverse socio-economic impacts in the surrounding communities. Significant loss of tourism business on which the Seashore villages depend for the very livelihood has occurred. These are measured impacts but they are not properly documented in the DEIS.  
I object to the existing restrictions and the adoption of any restrictions that would deny even more access. Species protection in the days prior to the Consent Decree was fair and adequate. The degree of access the public enjoyed needs to be restored.

**Correspondence ID:** 758    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a visitor to the Cape Hatteras Seashore for 39 years and have witnessed the changes that have come with beach access. To visitors and residents alike, these changes are unnecessary and unfair.  
The beach access under the Consent Decree is too restrictive. The NPS preferred alternative essentially mimics the current rules, and would be too restrictive as well. For other alternatives all access to the most popular and attractive locations on the Seashore would be denied. When the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area was created the federal government made certain pledges. The government intended the Seashore to be for the enjoyment of people, and pledged that beach access would be maintained at customary levels. Access has been steadily eroded over the years, mile after mile banned or limited, and the public's enjoyment has suffered. My enjoyment has suffered. This is a violation of the government's pledge. NPS's preferred alternative "F" would continue this ongoing violation of the public trust, spoiling the intent of Congress.  
The enabling legislation did not intend for the principal function of the Seashore to be its value as a wildlife preserve. The Seashore was preserved for recreation. There are many other areas on the outer banks that serve refuge functions, as intended by the government.  
One example of bias in the DEIS is the title of alternative "D", "Increased Predictability". This is quite deceitful. It is not an advantage for the public to easily know they will be consistently excluded from all SMAs forever. It should be titled "Most Restrictive", because that is what it is.  
I note there is no compelling evidence in the DEIS or elsewhere that shows that the current or proposed restrictions are having or would have any beneficial effect for the species. I also note no evidence exists proving an adverse impact of humans on the species. Natural forces and conditions on the Seashore, such as predation, storms, and suitable habitat, are the determinant of success or failure for species of concern, not humans. The DEIS is supposed to provide best available science but it does not. This violates NEPA requirements.  
There is, however, absolutely no doubt that the restrictions are having a negative effect on people by reducing their enjoyment of the Seashore. This has had direct adverse socio-economic impacts in the surrounding communities. Significant loss of tourism business on which the Seashore villages depend for the very livelihood has occurred. These are measured impacts but they are not properly documented in the DEIS.  
I object to the existing restrictions and the adoption of any restrictions that would deny even more access. Species protection in the days prior to the Consent Decree was fair and adequate. The degree of access the public enjoyed needs to be restored.

**Correspondence ID:** 759    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gill, Christopher G  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 15:04:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In the interest of protecting bird nests, beach access for fishermen on the OBX has been far too restricted. You can protect birds and still allow people to surf fish. Why must there be so vast a buffer zone around nests? Where is the "science" supporting this? When I have surf fished MA and NJ the buffer zones around nests are much smaller and whole beaches have not needed to be shut down. And to not allow fishing access at night is ridiculous--surf fishing is largely a night time pursuit.  
Why are vast areas of beach closed to even walking on? This has not been done elsewhere either, that I know of.  
Hatteras and Ocracoke have the finest surf fishing for Red Drum on the planet and people like myself are willing to spend hundreds and/or thousands of dollars a year in the local economy to pursue these fish, but the Park Service restrictions to beach access have made that impossible.  
On the north end of Hatteras at Pea Island there are already miles and miles of beach that is closed to ORV use and is set aside as a wildlife refuge. I do not support turning the rest of the OBX into just a bird refuge also. I thought the National Sea Shore was supposed to be a recreational area?

**Correspondence ID:** 760    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 15:46:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 761    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 15:46:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 762    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 15:46:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nixon, Gregory L  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 16:10:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My wife and I, and our family and friends, have been enjoying North Carolina's Outer Banks for more than 40 years. We rent houses in the spring and fall of the year, and enjoy surf fishing and the serene environment. In fact, since the fish are not always biting, we enjoy bird watching almost as much as catching fish. I'm now retired, but was once a Biology teacher, and canoe guide and instructor for the Chesapeake Bay Foundation. My wife heads up our county's Litter Council. We are very concerned with protection and preservation of our environment. We want our grandchildren to enjoy the Outer Banks as we have done for so long. There are very few places left on the Atlantic coast that offers one the ability to drive to remote places on the beach and enjoy fishing and bird watching all at the same time. I love fishing of all kinds, but none so dear as surf fishing. I have shared my love of this area and the great fishing with more than 100 other people over the years. Their first hand experience motivates them to protect this environment. I was happy that a compromise solution was reached last year. We rented a house in Avon for the entire month of October and fished every day, except one.

The limited access was a nuisance, but did not affect our ability to enjoy our stay. I just returned from a 4 day outing with several friends, and the increased limited access was more than a nuisance. I don't like fishing right next to other fisherman, and the limited access concentrates fisherman and the impact. If the restricted areas continue to increase in size and numbers, it will diminish the surf fishing experience to a point that I and others like me will stop coming. I'll do more boat fishing instead, which I believe has a more devastating impact on the environment overall. This won't happen overnight. Slowly, the number of surf fisherman will decline. The local tackle shops, who are struggling to survive now having to compete with on-line purchasing, will decline. As a result, the availability of fresh bait (critical) will decline, driving more fisherman away. There must be a better solution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 16:14:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 16:48:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm really opposed to any ORV on the outer banks.. Hatteras National Seashore. Ecologically, his is a very fragile environment. It is tough enough to have winds and storms for wildlife to deal with.. without the invasion of human traffic, oil spills and other man induced interruptions.  
 If the owners of ORV want to recreate, they have lots of other territory..  
 Sorry folks. Let's walk it.. or ride in a golf cart.. and save our fragile environments, ecology and future for our children Once it's gone.. it's gone..  
 I say no to a compromise.. nobody wins.. especially those who can't cast their vote..  
 Most respectfully,  
 Harriet Bellerjeau ..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 17:16:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. You should know New Jersey has banished even people footprints on segments of their islands during nesting periods for seaside birds.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 767    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cornelia, Jared  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 17:28:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cornelia, Jared  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 17:29:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and

preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Schneider, Kathleen  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 18:17:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been a visitor to the Outer Banks, specifically Hatteras Island, for more than 20 years. I believe the current policy has served everyone well. We visit in the Fall, and have not found the vehicles to be problematic, or even bothersome. Certainly, during higher usage periods, i think some curtailment of use is warranted, but not during the fall. I do not drive on the beaches myself, but believe responsible beach driving makes it a special place for many visitors every year. Thank you for allowing me to comment. Kathleen Schneider

---

**Correspondence ID:** 770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 18:51:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I question the requirement to exclude dogs which are leashed from any public areas. Humans and their animals are among those who make use of recreational facilities. There needs to be a balance among competing needs. I'm not sure that's been obtained in the outright exclusion of pets for defined periods.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 19:00:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,  
I disagree with the DEIS for the following reasons:  
1. I believe the 1000 m buffers for Piping Plovers is unreasonable, excessive and not based on any proven scientific evidence. Assateague island, MD uses 200 m buffers. There has not been any significant increase in birds under the Consent Decree.  
2. I disagree with the DEIS view on the impact of Alternative F to the socio-economic status of Cape Hatteras. Under the Consent decree, businesses have suffered. I know many people who will not return to the Outer Banks if they can not fish, swim, or surf their favorite beaches on the island.  
3. I disagree with the DEIS view on pets. Dogs on leashes pose no threat to birds or turtles.  
4. I agree with management but I feel the DEIS is not fair and balanced. Cape Hatteras was promised as a recreational area. There needs to be access to the surfzones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 19:16:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nultemeier, Brent  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 19:30:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly believe that closing the recreational beaches of the Outer Banks is a bad idea. I don't think there is enough strong evidence for wildlife rescue to take such drastic action on an area that has been open to the public for as long as it has. For instance, natural disasters and ferrel animals are noted to be a major harm to wildlife in the area. To compare the mass disruption from that and an off road vehicle accidentally running over a nest is not really comparing apples to apples. I believe that there are many other ways to help the wildlife rather than assuming it's caused by human harm. As a surfer, an environmentalist, fisherman and a beach visitor, it's beyond me why this has all the sudden become an issue to the extreme.  
Also, I would like to request the National Park Service to continue studying how these closures are affecting species survival in hopes of looser, more effective restrictions in the future.  
If I were to agree on any one of the options, it would be "Alternative C"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 774    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 19:39:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** cosby, charles c  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 19:41:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I own a rental home on Ocracoke Island and during this economic crisis the rental income is adversely effected as well as the Islands economy.I strongly favor protecting the environment but have real concerns about some of the rules and how they will effect tourism and not just my property but the welfare of the entire Islands financial stability.So many facets of the outer banks economy are fragile and rules such as those enacted may in many instances serve to curb tourism by those who become frustrated and have a knee jerk reaction to so many rules which can be viewed as curtailing the use of the beach.I think the government needs to be sensitive to these concerns and should develop a public relations program that encourages the use of the beaches as well as promoting environmental concerns .Just to come out with rules thar say no to this and that without at the same time encouraging wise use of the beaches will be a disservive to the citizens.The average person probably has no idea how the rules protecting the wildlife benefit mankind.People probably see the rules as Draconian and benefiting no one but rabid environmentalist,The government needs a cmpaign to show why the rules benefit all and to encourage tourism as well as conservation. Thanks for your consideration .Charles C Cosby Jr

**Correspondence ID:** 776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wood, Eugene  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 19:46:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Although you see my address is in New York, I was born and raised in NC and have family in Frisco. It seems hypocritical to ban ORV use because of conservation and bird sanctuary concerns, yet allow a marsh(wetland)area to become a parking lot. ORV use has a strong legal precedent in North Carolina and the fishermen and the thousands of other tourists visit OBX for the enjoyment of going for a "beach ride".

**Correspondence ID:** 777    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 19:58:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We currently visit NC during the summer and are looking to have a home on the beach to vacation and possibly retire. We enjoy driving and parking on the beach (at the ramps) and do understand the need for regulating.  
 We do think that over regulating would be a mistake for everyone at the beach as the local businesses do rely heavily on tourism.  
 We agree that "Alternative C ? Seasonal Management" would be the best alternative for the environment as well as the people / businesses within the community.  
 Thank you for allowing everyone to comment as we are all not available to attend the public hearing on the current plan.  
 David and Jeannette Viernes.

**Correspondence ID:** 778    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 20:16:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 779    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 20:16:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 780 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,26,2010 20:21:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First and for most,,Closing the beaches on the outer banks to pedestrian and ORV traffic would be disasteris to the economy and the lively hood of the people living there. I myself go to the outer banks twice a month to fish drive and spend time with family and friends on the beach. My family and I have met some very nice people there. In the years that I have been going to the outer banks I have yet to see a bird or turtle that have been run over. I just don't think it happens as much as we are made to think that it does. Going thru with this plan is about the crazeest thing that I have ever hereed. Who ever is making the decision needs set back and take a moment to get there head on strate. PLEASE PLEASE return the outer banks to the plan that the Park servtce has used for years. Please lesson to the people that this will hurt the most,the people that live there..

Thank you for letting me commit Henry C Sapp Jr csapp1@cox.net

**Correspondence ID:** 781 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,26,2010 20:24:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area DEIS Comment The legislation states: "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area." The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species. Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings. Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreation Area. ATVs are not permitted.These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach.

I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on Peer Reviewed science. Who better to advocate preservation of area wildlife than the people whose lives and futures are intertwined to the success of each species?

I would support these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m FLush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process, I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY

chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged. I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters. In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted? CORRIDORS are vital in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices. So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.26.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area DEIS Comment The legislation states: "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area." The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species. Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings. Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreation Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach.

I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on Peer Reviewed science. Who better to advocate preservation of area wildlife than the people whose lives and futures are intertwined to the success of each species?

I would support these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m FLush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m

MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process, I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged. I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter

pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters. In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted? CORRIDORS are vital in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices. So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species.

Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings.

Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach.

I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on Peer Reviewed science. Who better to advocate preservation of area wildlife than the people whose lives and futures are intertwined to the success of each species?

MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process, I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters. In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted? CORRIDORS are vital in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 784 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 20:46:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 785 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 20:46:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Please protect the environment and wildlife by providing an equal balance between the uses by humans and by wildlife. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 786 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 20:46:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 787 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 20:46:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 788 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 20:54:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a tax payer, kite surfer, and surfer. I support Alternative C.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 789 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 21:16:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 790 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 21:28:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the proposals you are making that will limit the rights of people who use the recreational values of the National Seashore in lieu of the rights for a few birds. A few birds who when they do breed are frequently lost due to mother nature anyway.  
You close sections of the beach and infringe on the rights of how many individuals because of a few birds who for whatever reason didn't get the message that the rest of them have left. They've migrated away to a better place to live.  
The rights of a few, sometimes one bird, oversees those of hundreds of families?? This is wrong. When most of these plovers have chosen on their own to move away from the area because the conditions are not conducive to breeding. They want to live where they can see for long stretches of beach. They don't want to nest near dunes or sea oats.  
Mother nature frequently wipes out their nests when there's higher than normal tides. This can happen multiple times. Give it up. There will be moon tides, northeasters and hurricanes. The majority of the birds have more sense than the humans who are trying to keep them where they shouldn't be. There will be feral cats who prey on the birds.  
Another point I want to disagree with is the banning of dogs from the National Seashore. People drive their vehicles to the water's edge to fish, swim and sunbath, thus using the national parks as they were intended to. Many of these peoples groups and families include dogs. It is unfair to punish all for the actions of a few who would allow their dogs to bother the birds. Again a few birds have more rights than people and their dogs? You have a leash policy in effect, enforce it.  
I deem it necessary to mention that the land over which you are planning policies for was given by the locals to the federal government for use by all persons as a recreational area. It was not given for use as a bird preserve. When you give more rights to the birds than the people, it's a bird ares not people area. It was given with the express intent that no development could ruin the beauty of the land and so that all people could continue to always

enjoy all that the National Seashore has to offer not just a few birds.

In light of this economy we are in I also cannot imagine why you would want to impose more restrictions that will effect the livelihoods even more of those who live in the area. Closing beaches and taking rights away from people to bring a leashed pet will only cause them to vacation elsewhere where they don't have such restrictions. This will hurt the local economy even more.

I respectfully ask you to reconsider whose rights are at stake here. The rights should go be in accordance for what the land was appropriated for from the beginning. It was set aside for people's use not for just birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 791    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 22:46:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 792    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 04:40:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a few paragraphs from my daughter's college research paper that pretty much sums it up.  
The Nerve of People Wanting to Enjoy the Beach Imagine growing up in one of the East Coast's most beautiful and popular vacation spots. The weather is mild, the area is surrounded by beaches, the wildlife is thriving, and the landscapes are breathless. Your entire life is here; you were born here, you have raised your children here, and you and your spouse own a small business in town. Where you live is not simply considered your address, it is what makes you who you are. You live for the beautiful days when you can walk along the beach or sit out on your porch in the morning and read the newspaper. This area is a part of you.  
Now think of being denied some of these activities that you have always loved. There are signs prohibiting use of certain areas you would usually walk your dog or take your children to play. Your favorite beach is blocked off from people by fences and you are now not allowed to drive your young children onto the beach anymore. Your business starts to decline because of the sudden decrease in tourists. Suddenly, a group of strangers are taking away one of the most important things in your life, under reasons that seem somewhat extreme. This unfair and tragic situation is occurring right now in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (CHNSRA). The people who have been living here for many years and who have continually taken care of the wildlife in this area are now being denied access to their beaches by unreasonable environmentalists who are very skeptical. The natives are insulted by the claims the environmentalists are making against them. They are creating harsh and false statements against the natives and saying that the beaches are not being taken care of properly. In many instances the people of the CHNSRA are portrayed as people who are purposely destroying the beaches because they simply do not care about the environment.  
Most of these people love the outdoors and hold a very special place in their heart for the wildlife and beaches where they live. They have the deepest respect for nature and appreciate it more than many other people in world. These people have devoted their lives to preserving this wildlife, and they do not need to join any fancy groups or call themselves environmentalists to prove it. The area where they live is one of the most important things in their lives. Long before Hatteras Island was ever designated by the Federal Government as a National Seashore Recreational Area, the local residents were already proven leaders in protecting wildlife (Preserve Beach Access). They are concerned that soon they will not be able to enjoy the outdoors anymore because of the new access restrictions that have been issued by these environmentalist groups.  
Although there are a few people who are exceptions to this, the environmentalists are harping on these exceptions and making the minority seem like the majority. These societies write articles claiming the cruelty and ignorance of the people who are living there. Many of the natives who respond negatively to the environmentalist are not negative about the environment; they are simply angered by these people. The few instances where the natives respond negatively to the environmentalists cannot be used to generalize how these people feel about the environment. It is simply unfair for the people of these societies to generalize the people who obviously are strongly bound to nature as people who want to destroy it. The environmentalists fear the extinction of the organisms that inhabit these beaches, such as the piping plover, loggerhead sea turtle, and seabeach amaranth, which are currently endangered (Cape Hatteras). They claim the people living here are the cause of the declines in these animal populations, when this is obviously untrue. This decrease has nothing to do with humans and people cannot be considered the natural enemy of wildlife. The natural enemies are the animals that eat these animals as prey, such as foxes. Although it is unfortunate to witness strong predators eating the weaker prey, this is the natural way of life (Preserve Beach Access).  
Not only are the natives angry about beach access being denied, but the tourists of this area are upset also. Being able to drive on the beach was a huge part of the CHNSRA's tourist attraction and history. Fishermen who need a lot of equipment greatly appreciated this privilege. Elderly people, small children, and other physically disabled people could also positively take advantage of this. My family has been taking vacations to the CHNSRA for many years now. Because of the allowance of ORVs on the beach at the time, I was able to experience the beach and hold a fishing rod for the first time when I was only eight months old. Today, nature is a huge part of my life and I plan on studying marine biology in the future. Although he did not live in Cape Hatteras, the beach was a huge part of my Grandfather's life also. He loved to fish and just simply be outside by the beach. Even though at his very old age he could not walk very well and could not stay in the sun for long periods of time, he was able to fish on the shores of Cape Hatteras a few more times before he passed away. This would not have been possible if my family was not allowed to drive on the beach.  
Now that this privilege is being denied, the tourist rate has decreased exponentially. Most of the shops and markets here are locally owned and therefore the natives rely on the tourism for success in their businesses. If the beach denials continue and the tourist industry continues to decline, many of the natives fear that they will have to move somewhere else in order to make a living and support themselves and their families. This idea devastates many, since this area really is one of the most important things in their lives.  
Although this issue seems small, if this continues everyone could be affected. The people whose lives revolve around nature all over the world could

begin to be denied their privileges also. Beaches all over could begin to be shut down due to this idea that humans are the reason for the extinction of animals. The only answer to this problem is education. By teaching people about their environment and the creatures that live here, more people will have respect for where they live. Rashly denying people their beach access is not helping the situation at all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 793    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 04:56:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Folks,  
My family and I live 800 miles from Ocracoke Island and have been making the long journey to the Outer Banks for over 30 years for vacations. My grown children and grandchildren also now vacation in the Outer Banks. Besides the peace and quiet the main reason we make the trip is the opportunity to drive to our favorite fishing spots on the beach. Not many places offer this opportunity. Without ORV access to the beach, Ocracoke becomes just another fishing spot. The past several years we have spent the entire months of May and October on Ocracoke. Along with the time we spend on the Island, we spend over \$10,000 for the local economy. We will not continue this long tradition if we do not have access to the entire beach. The Island is too small to cram all fishermen and women into a smaller geographical area.  
Most fishermen and women are protectors of nature and respect all forms of life by the sea. We understand the need to ensure that certain species survive and prosper. Unfortunately when politics and money force the direction of the argument, the species fall in their order of importance. In reading the results of the current consent decree, there appears to be no benefit of closures to the species being protected. Don't let politics and money provide false hope.  
Education and Law Enforcement will result in a much more successful result for all. My family is counting in you making a rational decision for all species, including the Human species. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 794    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 05:17:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 795    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** west, randy  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 05:23:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Kiteboarders for pollution free alternative to motorboating. VOTE FOR KITEBOARDING VOTE FOR REDUCED POLLUTION! VOTE "C"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Please protect the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore, recreational use of off road vehicles should be consistent with this protection and preferably banned from all beaches. If not all, then most. Dogs on leashes should also be enforced.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
Sincerely, Amy Davies 41 Traincroft, Medford, MA 02155

**Correspondence ID:** 797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27,2010 06:24:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area DEIS Comment

The legislation states: "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area."  
The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species.  
Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings.  
Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.  
The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach.  
I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer reviewed science.  
I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m  
MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.  
Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process,  
\*\*\* I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.  
MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).  
MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.  
I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters. In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted? ORV CORRIDORS are vital in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on Peer-Reviewed Science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices.  
So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.  
Thank You

**Correspondence ID:** 798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.27.2010 06:38:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Being from NJ where the beaches are very crowded and vehicles are not allowed on the beach, we have enjoyed many years on the beautiful Ocracoke Beaches. My friends and family have truly loved the freedom of taking our SUV's on the beach, picnicing and enjoying the surf. Do not let this ordinance pass prohibiting vehicles and dogs on the beach. Ocracoke will definitely lose much of their tourist trade. My family and friends, will not be taking an 11 hour drive down to the Outer Banks to sit on the beach any longer if we are going to have the same restrictions we now have in New Jersey. Believe me, we will just stay in New Jersey and give our own State our hard earned vacation money. North Carolina will lose out on the much needed tourist revenue if these restrictions are put into place.

**Correspondence ID:** 799 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.27.2010 06:51:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** While I respect all wildlife I feel Alt. F is too restrictive and I support the pro-ORV access coalition's positions. Also I believe Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area is marginal plover habitat and not worth denying the taxpaying American public of inexpensive recreational opportunities, esp. during the current recession.

**Correspondence ID:** 800 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.27.2010 06:51:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Well i guess ocracoke will become a town with no visitors. How many millions of birds do you see on all of the little islands and beaches of NC,i think you are being very unfair about the access to the beaches.Fishermen are ocracoke's life. Keep the beaches open to the public.

**Correspondence ID:** 801 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.27.2010 07:03:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm a retired N.C. Wildlife Officer. I have worked the entire coast of N.C. at some point in my career, including the CHNSS. I have also enjoyed fishing and camping on our N.C. coast. And after 30 years of doing wildlife law enforcement work, I have seen it is possible to use our natural resources without abusing them. The plans of the NPS to greatly restrict access to the ocean by all persons, is going way to far in its attempt to protect the natural resources. Being involved in wildlife research myself in the past, I know it is easy to gather facts to favor one opinion or another, and then use those facts to make regulations that one group or another wants implemented. I feel thats going on here, and it is having a very negative affect on many peoples lives. Enviornmental extremists should not have this much influence on the NPS policies and regulations.

**Correspondence ID:** 802 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.27.2010 07:11:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** CHNS Recreational Area DEIS Comment

ORV CORRIDORS are the best way in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on Peer-Reviewed Science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation.

Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings.

The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species.

Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach.

I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer peer reviewed science.

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as

needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process,

\*\*\* I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters. In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted?

So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 803    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27,2010 07:11:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** April 26, 2010 Michael Murray Superintendent Outer Banks Group National Park Service

Re: Comments on DEIS

Dear Superintendent Murray,

The proposed plans do not:

1. Sufficiently identify criteria for establishing pedestrian only access beaches with high "NPS Values".
2. Identify high or moderate NPS "Value" areas.
3. Acknowledge the negative impact of scenic features and natural visibility caused by off road vehicles.

Please consider these points when formulating the final ORV plan.

Sincerely,

Jim Lyons

Routes & Areas

1. Introduction

This proposal evaluates and synthesizes pertinent information to establish criteria in forming an ORV management plan. The goal of these comments is to help formulate a coherent, functional ORV management plan.

Proposal:

8 Gives consideration to the following four distinct pedestrian access users: 1. ORV users seeking pedestrian access from starting from ORV trails 2.

Pedestrians that enter the Seashore from their home, rental house or motel 3. Pedestrians seeking easy egress 4. Pedestrians seeking a remote NPS experience with high NPS Values

8 Gives consideration to ORV access users seeking: 1. ORV access in front of villages 2. Access to highly popular high use areas 3. Remote areas

8 Takes into consideration economic, historical and logistical use

8 Proposes many popular areas for ORV access

8 Presents criteria for selecting pedestrian areas

8 Identifies areas for pedestrian access

8 Presents applicable laws that pertain to pedestrian access and NPS values

2.Rational For Pedestrian Only Access With Consideration To An ORV Management Plan

An ORV management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CHNS) must establish areas that guarantees visitors an opportunity to experience NPS Values (as described in Management Policies 2006) to a high degree in addition to minimizing recreational conflicts. In April 27, 1999 a precedent was set in CHNS where visitor use conflicts were addressed and a recreational activity regulated as a result. The NPS banned Personal Water Craft (PWC) use in CHNS because of visitor use conflicts and impairment of NPS values. "Probably the strongest complaints come from land-based visitors. Beach walkers, people looking for shells, birdwatchers, sunbathers, artists, photographers, or those who simply stand on the shore to appreciate the visual beauty and natural sounds of the Seashore voice frequent complaints about the behavior of PWC operators and the noise PWCs produce. The natural sounds of the barrier island environment are a prime component of the seashore experience and PWCs often intrude upon this experience." (1) Some visitors find a similar recreational conflict with ORV use on the Seashore beaches. They find that the visual beauty and natural sounds of the Seashore are impaired by ORV use. Even lightly traversed ORV beaches will have ruts in the sand disfiguring the day-to-day physiographic process of the beach. At night, vehicle lights from ORVs can create a recreational conflict with pedestrians on Park beaches. The Enabling legislation for CHNS clearly intended for this Park to be preserved as remote seashore. ("permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness")(2). ORV use has enabled large numbers of visitors to drive to areas of CHNS that otherwise would have been seldom visited, diminishing a wilderness experience.

Establishing high NPS Value and Pedestrian Only Access (POA) areas in CHNS will not exclude anyone or deny appropriate recreational activities ("swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, and other recreational activities of similar nature")(2) to the Seashore. The CHNS Enabling legislation is not specific to the type of access needed to engage in these recreational pursuits. ORV use is one of several historical means of access and should be considered when it is equitably balanced with non-ORV access and complies with NPS Policy, Acts of Congress and Executive Orders.

The following documents address NPS Values: Management Policies 2006, The 1916 Organic Act, The 1970 National Park System General Authorities Act, as amended in 1978, The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Enabling Legislation, Executive Order 11644 and United States Code (3).

It should not be taken as a given that all of the high value areas in CHNS will be ORV routes. Management Policies 2006 outlines rational and attributes for NPS Values. The Organic Act places a high value on the no-impairment standard and includes identified NPS values subject to the no impairment standard as well as resource issues. The Cape Hatteras Enabling Legislation intended this park to be managed for a diverse set of recreational activities as long as those activities do not impair resources or NPS values. ("no development of the project or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in this area")(2) Physiographic conditions are an identified NPS value. ("physical processes that created the park and continue to act upon it" 1.4.6

Management Policies 2006)(3) When deciding locations of ORV routes and areas it is equally important to consider the quality and establishment of POA areas. Suitable areas that address NPS values have to be identified, provided and protected.

With consideration of NPS Policy, Acts of Congress and Executive Orders, listed below are criteria for establishing POA beaches that address NPS values and areas in CHNS that meet those criteria.

### 3. Criteria

Suggested Criteria For Establishing Pedestrian Only Access Only Beaches With High "NPS Values"

1. Outside of ORV trails or Routes 2. Quality Beaches Scenic features; natural visibility, both day and night; natural landscapes; natural soundscapes and smells") a. In an unaltered state with minimal adjacent infrastructure, b. Natural coastal and dune building processes, c. Observable wildlife resources, d. Wide beach with minimal degree of slope, 3. Ease of egress, all egress through NPS property with ramps, boardwalks or established breaks through the dune 4. Traditional pedestrian beaches, beaches that have been used extensively for pedestrian access only in the past and have suitable established parking infrastructure 5. Diversity of experience a. Areas convenient to NPS services b. Remote areas

### 4. Areas

High NPS "Value" areas 1. Bodie Island Spit, 2. The south groin in Buxton to Cape Point, 3. Cape Point to the Frisco village line, 4. Ramp 55 to Hatteras Inlet, 5. The North end of Ocracoke Island (Hatteras Inlet), 6. The Ocracoke Pony Pen south to the NPS Campground 7. South Point (Ocracoke).

Moderate "NPS Value" areas 1. South Salvo to North Avon 2. South Avon to approximately 1 mile North of the Buxton Village line 3. Frisco Bathhouse to Hatteras Village 4. Other areas of Ocracoke.

### 5. Routes

#### A. Bodie Island

CAHA northern boundary to 2 miles south first NPS ORV ramp designated as Ramp 2 \_ Pedestrians access only \_ Ramp 1 for emergency ramp only Ramp 2 south to approximately 200 m north of Oregon inlet campground \_ ORV access

200 m north of Oregon Inlet campground to 200 m south of Oregon Inlet campground \_ Seasonally ORV access (Date to coincide with opening and closing of Oregon Inlet campground) \_ Seasonal pedestrian access only \_ Construct new Ramp 200 m south of Oregon Inlet campground

New Ramp south of OI campground to southern most point of Bodie Island \_ ORV access

Soundside Bodie Island \_ Status Quo \_ Establish minimum widths on sound side ORV routes and cul-de-sac with sufficient turning width that vegetation is unimpaired

#### B. Hatteras Island

Rodanthe, Waves, and Salvo to Ramp 23 \_ Seasonal pedestrians access only \_ Seasonal ORV access \_ Dates to be determined by Villages

Subcommittee or NPS \_ Construct handicapped accessible, pedestrian boardwalk just north of Ramp #23 \_ Add a new ramp 2 miles south of Ramp 23

Ramp 23 to new Ramp (2 miles south of Ramp 23) \_ Pedestrians access only \_ Construct handicapped accessible, pedestrian boardwalk just south of

Ramp 23 New Ramp (2 miles south of Ramp 23) to Relocated Ramp 34 \_ (Ramp 34 to be relocated 2 miles north of Avon village line. \_ Construct

handicapped accessible, pedestrian boardwalk just south of Ramp 34 \_ ORV access

Relocated Ramp 34 to Avon Village Line \_ Pedestrians access only \_ Construct handicapped accessible, pedestrian boardwalk at Relocated Ramp 34

Avon Village north boundary to Avon Village south boundary \_ Seasonal pedestrians access only \_ Seasonal ORV access \_ Dates to be determined by

Villages Subcommittee or NPS Soundside, South end of Salvo to North end of Avon \_ Status quo \_ Establish minimum widths on sound side ORV

routes and cul-de-sac with sufficient turning width that vegetation is unimpaired

Relocated Ramp 38 to New Ramp (located 2 miles south of relocated Ramp 38) \_ Relocate ramp 38 to 1 mile north of the Haulover \_ Establish new

Ramp 2 miles south of Ramp 38 \_ Pedestrian access only \_ Construct handicapped accessible, pedestrian boardwalk at both ramps

New Ramp (2 miles south of relocated Ramp 38) to Buxton north boundary \_ ORV access

Buxton Village north boundary to Buxton Village south boundary \_ Seasonal pedestrians access only \_ Buxton Village south boundary starts at north

groin at Old Coast Guard Base \_ Seasonal ORV access \_ Dates to be determined by Villages Subcommittee or NPS \_ Establish emergency Ramp at

Buxton Village north boundary

South Buxton boundary To Ramp 43 \_ Pedestrians access only

Ramp 43 to New Ramp 49 \_ Open to ORVs \_ Move Ramp 49 to 500 m east of eastern boundary of NPS Frisco Campground \_ Construct a new

interdunal road to connect relocated ramp 49 with campground entrance road

Ramp 49 to Ramp 55 \_ Pedestrians access only \_ Construct a parking lot and handicapped accessible pedestrian boardwalk board walks at old ramp 49

site. \_ Expand existing parking lot at Ramp #55

Ramp 55 to Hatteras Inlet \_ ORV access

Frisco Soundside \_ Status quo \_ Establish minimum widths on sound side ORV routes and cul-de-sac with sufficient turning width that vegetation is unimpaired

Hatteras Inlet soundside \_ Status quo \_ Establish minimum widths on sound side ORV routes and cul-de-sac with sufficient turning width that

vegetation is unimpaired

#### C. OCRACOKE ISLAND

Hatteras Inlet (North End of Ocracoke) to Ramp 59 \_ Pedestrians access only \_ Relocate Ramp 59 to MP 64 \_ Establish 2 hiking trails from enhanced

parking area at NC Ferry docks and relocated Ramp 59

Relocated Ramp 59 to North End Turnout \_ ORV access

North End Turnout Ramp to Ramp 70 \_ Pedestrians access only \_ Move Ramp 70 to Ocracoke Day use area \_ Establish Parking areas and handicapped

accessible, pedestrian boardwalk and bath room facilities at North End Turnout and at Ramp 70 \_ Improve parking lot and handicapped accessible,

pedestrian boardwalk and tail at old Ramp 67 site

Ocracoke Day use Area (relocated ramp 70) to southern most point of South Point (Ocracoke Inlet) \_ ORV access Ocracoke Island, Soundside \_ Status

quo \_ Establish minimum widths on sound side ORV routes and cul-de-sac with sufficient turning width that vegetation is unimpaired

1. L3425 (CAHA) April 27, 1999 Memorandum To: Files From: Superintendent, Outer Banks Group Subject: Determination on Appropriateness of Personal Watercraft Use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore Probably the strongest complaints come from land-based visitors. Beach walkers, people looking for shells, birdwatchers, sunbathers, artists, photographers, or those who simply stand on the shore to appreciate the visual beauty and natural sounds of the Seashore voice frequent complaints about the behavior of PWC operators and the noise PWCs produce. The natural sounds of the barrier island environment are a prime component of the seashore experience and PWC often intrude upon this experience.

2. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Enabling legislation

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Enabling legislation (1. (Aug. 17, 1937, ch. 687, Sec. 4, 50 Stat. 670; June 29, 1940, ch. 459, Sec. 1, 54 Stat. 702; Mar. 6, 1946, ch. 50, 60 Stat. 32.) emphasizes recreational opportunities for visitors to the Seashore, "except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, particularly swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness and no development of the project or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in this area . . ."

3. Management Policies 2006 (<http://www.nps.gov/policy/mp/policies.html>) "1.4.3 The NPS Obligation to Conserve and Provide for Enjoyment of Park Resources and Values "The fundamental purpose of all parks also includes providing for the enjoyment of park resources and values by the people of the United States. The enjoyment that is contemplated by the statute is broad; it is the enjoyment of all the people of the United States and includes enjoyment both by people who visit parks and by those who appreciate them from afar. It also includes deriving benefit (including scientific knowledge) and inspiration from parks, as well as other forms of enjoyment and inspiration. Congress, recognizing that the enjoyment by future generations of the national parks can be ensured only if the superb quality of park resources and values is left unimpaired, has provided that when there is a conflict between conserving resources and values and providing for enjoyment of them, conservation is to be predominant. This is how courts have consistently interpreted the Organic Act. 1.4.5 (1.)"

"1.4.6 What Constitutes Park Resources and Values" "The "park resources and values" that are subject to the No-impairment standard include \* the park's scenery, natural and historic objects, and wildlife, and the processes and conditions that sustain them, including, to the extent present in the park:

the ecological, biological, and physical processes that created the park and continue to act upon it; scenic features; natural visibility, both in daytime and at night; natural landscapes; natural soundscapes and smells; water and air resources; soils; geological resources; paleontological resources; archeological resources; cultural landscapes; ethnographic resources; historic and prehistoric sites, structures, and objects; museum collections; and native plants and animals; \* appropriate opportunities to experience enjoyment of the above resources, to the extent that can be done without impairing them; \* the park's role in contributing to the national dignity, the high public value and integrity, and the superlative environmental quality of the national park system, and the benefit and inspiration provided to the American people by the national park system; and \* any additional attributes encompassed by the specific values and purposes for which the park was established"

"1.4.7.1 Unacceptable Impacts \* be inconsistent with a park's purposes or values, or \* impede the attainment of a park's desired future conditions for natural and cultural resources as identified through the park's planning process, or

\*create an unsafe or unhealthful environment for visitors or employees, or \* diminish opportunities for current or future generations to enjoy, learn about, or be inspired by park resources or values, or \* unreasonably interfere with

1. park programs or activities, or 2. an appropriate use, or 3. the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, or the natural soundscape maintained in wilderness and natural, historic, or commemorative locations within the park. 4. NPS concessioner or contractor operations or services."

#### 8.1 General

"Many different types of uses take place in the hundreds of park units that make up the national park system. Some of those uses are carried out by the National Park Service, but many more are carried out by park visitors, permittees, lessees, and licensees. The 1916 Organic Act, which created the National Park Service, directs the Service to conserve park resources "unimpaired" for the enjoyment of future generations. The 1970 National Park System General Authorities Act, as amended in 1978, prohibits the Service from allowing any activities that would cause derogation of the values and purposes for which the parks have been established (except as directly and specifically provided by Congress). Taken together, these two laws establish for NPS managers (1) a strict mandate to protect park resources and values; (2) a responsibility to actively manage all park uses; and (3) when necessary, an obligation to regulate their amount, kind, time, and place in such a way that future generations can enjoy, learn, and be inspired by park resources and values and appreciate their national significance in as good or better condition than the generation that preceded them. (Throughout these Management Policies, the term "impairment" is construed to also encompass "derogation.") "

Executive Order 11644 Executive Order 11644 requires that ORV use must be promulgated in National Parks that do not include specially sanctioned ORV use in the enabling legislation for that park (CHNS). The executive order specially requires establishing policies and procedures to ensure that off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed to protect the resources of those lands, promote the safety of all users of those lands, and minimize conflicts among those users.

"(a) (3): Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors. (a) (4): Areas and trails shall be located in areas of the National Park system only if the respective agency head determines that off-road vehicle use in such locations will not adversely affect their natural, aesthetic, or scenic values."

U.S.C. Code 16 U.S.C. Section 1a-1 states, "The authorization of activities shall be conducted in the light of the high public value and integrity of the National Park System and shall not be exercised in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been or shall be directly and specifically provided by Congress."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Conover, John

**Received:** Apr,27,2010 07:19:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,27,2010 07:21:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** CHNS Recreational Area DEIS Comment

ORV CORRIDORS are the best way in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on Peer-Reviewed Science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation.

Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings.

The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species.

Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed

public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach.

I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer reviewed science.

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process,

\*\*\* I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters. In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted?

So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 07:26:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** CHNSRA DEIS Comment:

In my opinion, there is no peer reviewed scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted?

ORV CORRIDORS are the best way in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on Peer-Reviewed Science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation.

Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings.

The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species.

Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime

child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach.

I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer reviewed science.

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process,

\*\*\* I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters.

So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

Thank You

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	807	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 07:27:07						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	CHNSRA DEIS Comment:						

In my opinion, there is no peer reviewed scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted?

ORV CORRIDORS are the best way in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on Peer-Reviewed Science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation.

Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings.

The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species.

Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach.

I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer reviewed science.

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process,

\*\*\* I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters.

So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 07:28:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
Thank you,  
Joyce Marcus joycemarcus@hotmail.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 809    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 08:17:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 810    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Purkey, Jon G  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 08:38:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for allowing the public to comment on this proposal. While I agree that an ORV and Pedestrian Management program is warranted in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area, several aspects of these proposals seem to be ill-thought out and inconsistent with the original intentions of the Park Service when the seashore was designated as a park in the 1930s.  
Most striking is the lack of recognition of the cultural significance and cultural history associated with ORV and Pedestrian use of this area. With ample historical evidence that this access is a "way of life" on Hatteras Island and Ocaroke, it is quite unsettling and disappointing to see this aspect being ignored, even though it is one of the aspects that by definition should be strongly considered in the DEIS. Before making such a sweeping change in

policy that will dramatically negatively impact such a wide range of citizens, I would like to see empirical data that suggests this way of life has significantly negatively impacted the shorebird and turtle population. Unfortunately, even using the USPS data, this argument cannot be made effectively. As a follow on to this comment, the empirical evidence that states that ORV and pedestrian use is detrimental to wildlife in the area is shaky, at best. Unfortunately, it seems the USPS and their Predator Removal Program is killing many more animals than the ORV and Pedestrian traffic. This inconsistency is unacceptable, in my opinion.

I am in favor of buffers around nesting areas, but the 1000M Proposed buffer will effectively close any beach, due to the geographic characteristics of these narrow beaches. I also have serious concerns with the data collection techniques used to determine these alternatives. Not counting the adjacent spoil sites and islands, some less than a few miles from impacted areas, leads to skewed data. These islands and their shorebird populations MUST be counted to arrive at factually correct data points.

One of the most dramatic inconsistencies I see in the document concerns the economic impact that is described in the Region of Influence (ROI). Using economic and visitor data from the North Beaches ( Corolla/Duck) to support the position that these alternatives will not have dramatic negative economic impacts is wrong. Only data from the towns on Hatteras Island and Ocracoke should be used. To surmise that visitors from the Northern Beaches will visit Hatteras Island and Ocracoke consistently during their vacation is incorrect. I would like to see the justification for including these communities in the economic impact study, if there is such justification. As a lifelong visitor to both the Northern Beaches and the islands, I just don't see it. Northern Beach visitors rarely travel south of Nags Head, and if so MAY designate one day of their five to visit Hatteras and Ocracoke, not five. The limits on Pedestrian traffic, totally outlawing any foot traffic on the beach, is Draconian and not supported by any data in a consistent fashion. Studies do show, that without foot traffic and ORV traffic, certain predators (one the USPS cannot target with their Predator Removal Program (i.e. Ghost Crabs) will in fact have dramatically easier access to shorebird and turtle eggs. Simply put, the data collected so far, even using USPS studies, does not show an adverse negative impact on local shorebird and turtle populations. So why is this access being reduced/eliminated?

To eliminate access to one of the best fishing, surfing, kiteboarding, and birdwatching areas on the east coast will effectively bankrupt the local economy and eliminate hundreds of jobs, and effectively doing away with cultural traditions that have been in place for many years.

No Pets in the park? That is completely inconsistent with the original declaration of this area being a recreation area when it was designated as such in the 1930's.

This area was designated as a recreation area, not a sanctuary. Why it need to be designated a sanctuary at this point, is not clear. The shore birds in question are not on the endangered species list, and different turtle nesting protections, ones that have been used in other areas with great success, need to be implemented here prior to eliminating all access to this great area.

I am in agreement that an effective management program needs to be developed for this unique area. I strongly feel the proposed alternatives do not adequately address the dramatic cultural and economic impacts that will effectively destroy this way of life. At the very least, I feel that the underlying data supporting many of the positions be more thoroughly reviewed and corrected before making a decision of this magnitude.

I have been experiencing this way of life since I was born, and have spent a large part of my 48 years on the Outer Banks. I feel I have the experience pertaining to this way of life that makes me qualified to comment on this issue.

Again, thank you for allowing these comments on the DEIS.

Sincerely,

Jon Gregory "Greg" Purkey

**Correspondence ID:** 811    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Purkey, Jon G

**Received:** Apr,27,2010 08:44:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Thank you for allowing the public to comment on this proposal. While I agree that an ORV and Pedestrian Management program is warranted in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area, several aspects of these proposals seem to be ill-thought out and inconsistent with the original intentions of the Park Service when the seashore was designated as a park in the 1930's.

Most striking is the lack of recognition of the cultural significance and cultural history associated with ORV and Pedestrian use of this area. With ample historical evidence that this access is a "way of life" on Hatteras Island and Ocracoke, it is quite unsettling and disappointing to see this aspect being ignored, even though it is one of the aspects that by definition should be strongly considered in the DEIS. Before making such a sweeping change in policy that will dramatically negatively impact such a wide range of citizens, I would like to see empirical data that suggests this way of life has significantly negatively impacted the shorebird and turtle population. Unfortunately, even using the USPS data, this argument cannot be made effectively.

As a follow on to this comment, the empirical evidence that states that ORV and pedestrian use is detrimental to wildlife in the area is shaky, at best. Unfortunately, it seems the USPS and their Predator Removal Program is killing many more animals than the ORV and Pedestrian traffic.

This inconsistency is unacceptable, in my opinion.

I am in favor of buffers around nesting areas, but the 1000M Proposed buffer will effectively close any beach, due to the geographic characteristics of these narrow beaches. I also have serious concerns with the data collection techniques used to determine these alternatives. Not counting the adjacent spoil sites and islands, some less than a few miles from impacted areas, leads to skewed data. These islands and their shorebird populations MUST be counted to arrive at factually correct data points.

One of the most dramatic inconsistencies I see in the document concerns the economic impact that is described in the Region of Influence (ROI). Using economic and visitor data from the North Beaches ( Corolla/Duck) to support the position that these alternatives will not have dramatic negative economic impacts is wrong. Only data from the towns on Hatteras Island and Ocracoke should be used. To surmise that visitors from the Northern Beaches will visit Hatteras Island and Ocracoke consistently during their vacation is incorrect. I would like to see the justification for including these communities in the economic impact study, if there is such justification. As a lifelong visitor to both the Northern Beaches and the islands, I just don't see it. Northern Beach visitors rarely travel south of Nags Head, and if so MAY designate one day of their five to visit Hatteras and Ocracoke, not five. The limits on Pedestrian traffic, totally outlawing any foot traffic on the beach, are Draconian and not supported by any data in a consistent fashion. Studies do show, that without foot traffic and ORV traffic, certain predators (one the USPS cannot target with their Predator Removal Program (i.e. Ghost Crabs) will in fact have dramatically easier access to shorebird and turtle eggs. Simply put, the data collected so far, even using USPS studies, does not show an adverse negative impact on local shorebird and turtle populations. So why is this access being reduced/eliminated?

To eliminate access to one of the best fishing, surfing, kiteboarding, and bird watching areas on the east coast will effectively bankrupt the local economy and eliminate hundreds of jobs, and effectively doing away with cultural traditions that have been in place for many years.

No Pets in the park? That is completely inconsistent with the original declaration of this area being a recreation area when it was designated as such in the 1930's.

This area was designated as a recreation area, not a sanctuary. Why it need to be designated a sanctuary at this point, is not clear. The shore birds in question are not on the endangered species list, and different turtle nesting protections, ones that have been used in other areas with great success, need to be implemented here prior to eliminating all access to this great area.

I am in agreement that an effective management program needs to be developed for this unique area. I strongly feel the proposed alternatives do not adequately address the dramatic cultural and economic impacts that will effectively destroy this way of life. At the very least, I feel that the underlying data supporting many of the positions be more thoroughly reviewed and corrected before making a decision of this magnitude.

I have been experiencing this way of life since I was born, and have spent a large part of my 48 years on the Outer Banks. I feel I have the experience pertaining to this way of life that makes me qualified to comment on this issue.

Again, thank you for allowing these comments on the DEIS.

Sincerely,

Jon Gregory "Greg" Purkey Va Beach, VA

**Correspondence ID:** 812    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27,2010 08:55:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello.

I am a retired Federal employee, and many of my years were spent working as a National Park Service Ranger. I have also been an angler all my life, and I began surf fishing the Outer Banks from an old Ford Bronco in 1977. Cape Hatteras National Seashore was created to be a recreational area. Preserve the area, but also let visitors enjoy it for recreation. Humans and wildlife share the resource. We have Wildlife Refuges, such as Pea Island, where wildlife comes first. As such, I am in favor of continued beach access by ORVs. I understand that there need to be some restrictions for wildlife or safety in some cases. However, I am opposed to any permanent closures of any parts of the Seashore, and I am opposed to the restriction of night driving. Some of the best surf fishing is at night! I am not opposed to operators of the beach needing a permit to drive on the beach. That would allow education of visitors. I think the plan proposed by the Coalition For Beach Access makes much more sense, and is far easier to read, than the DEIS proposals. To me, the CFBA plan makes the most sense for continuing the Seashore's function of recreation combined with preservation. Lastly, the OBX is not the last possible nesting grounds available for east coast shore birds. I also fish Virginia's barrier islands, which are totally undeveloped, and it is a nesting bird's paradise. There are miles of deserted beaches and marsh, and there are plenty of birds that use this area. Thanks you for your consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 813    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27,2010 09:14:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My CHNSRA DEIS Comments:

Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings. In my opinion, there is no peer reviewed scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted? ORV CORRIDORS are the best way in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on Peer-Reviewed Science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation. The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species. Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours. The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach. I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer peer reviewed science. I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process, \*\*\* I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions. MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters). MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged. I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are

defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters.

So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 814    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My CHNSRA DEIS Comments:

Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings.

In my opinion, there is no peer reviewed scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted?

ORV CORRIDORS are the best way in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on Peer-Reviewed Science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation.

The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species.

Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach.

I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer peer reviewed science.

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process,

\*\*\* I formally requests the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted. The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters. The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters.

0008972

So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 815    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 09:48:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Our Piping Plovers are current Canaries in the Coal Mine for our Eastern seashores. Please support this plan for our sake and that of our descendants. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 816    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 10:09:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I understand the need to preserve species and develop a balance between nature and human interests. However, I feel that the possibility of losing access to the beaches of Hatteras Village will significantly effect the residents of this village. They are already experiencing a negative impact from the down economy - this will only push them further away from just trying to feed their families and rake out a living. A huge tourist draw to this area is surf fishing. When tourists cant drive down to the beach they will quit coming. This will effect rental properties and then you will see more and more homes foreclosing and a reduction in purchases. It is unbelievable to me that a better compromise cannot be made. I have supported areas being closed during nesting sitings, but the thought of having a schedule in stone is upsetting. You would still close the beaches even if no nesting was underway??? A huge reason I love Hatteras Village is bringing my dog to the beach to swim. I am a responsible pet owner and never allow my dog to chase birds or enter the dune areas. Hopefully the representatives making the final decisions will consider the impact on the residents of Hatteras Village and make the right fair decision.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 817    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks, I understand that Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.  
Sincerely,  
Melissa Kay Davis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Schawang, Sandra E  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 11:08:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am opposed to Alternative F. I do not understand the justification for the restrictiveness of this proposal. I support the Coalition for Beach Access Proposal. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore was established as a RECREATIONAL area - and should remain a RECREATIONAL area. From all that I have read, nothing in science supports the restrictions proposed in Alternative F (or the consent decree we have been living under for two years, either). Let's do what the National Seashore was established for - and use it for recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 11:18:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27,2010 11:18:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 821    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27,2010 11:18:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Barker II, John D  
**Received:** Apr.27,2010 11:40:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in support of free and open beach access of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. This park was granted by congress in 1937 as a recreational area for the public and should still be as such today (Aug. 17, 1937, ch. 687, Sec. 1, 50 Stat. 669; June 29, 1940, ch. 459, Sec. 1, 54 Stat. 702.) By severely restricting access to both ORVs and pedestrians, it has and will continue to have a major negative impact on the entire economy for the region and with no real positive benefit to the wildlife in the area.

The areas that people access the beaches are not areas of nesting terrestrial wildlife. Previous methods of protecting sea turtles were fair and effective,

and many users supported these efforts. The science so far has proven that the temporary interim plan has shown no sort of positive result to the wildlife being protected. How can the Consent Decree be justified with these results?

These restrictions, if continued, will cause the economy to collapse for these areas of Dare and Hyde county. Bankruptcies, more foreclosures, crime, etc., will become more commonplace. The people of the area will not be able to sustain, and at the same time there will be no real positive result in numbers for the wildlife. No benefit at all.

No one wants to see the wildlife negatively affected by having beach access, not the beach goers, no one. But this is not the way to help restore the numbers of certain wildlife in the area.

I want H.R. 718 and S 1557 to be restored!

Thank You, John D. Barker II

---

**Correspondence ID:** 823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 11:50:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a frequent visitor to Cape Hatteras, and have always been impressed by the pristine beauty and the wonderful ecological balance the shoreline. please forgive the "form letter" that follows, but the folks at Surfrider have summed up my concerns perfectly. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area. I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** West, Richard  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 12:05:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** vote for Alternative C

---

**Correspondence ID:** 825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 12:18:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 12:50:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am totally against the proposed DEIS alternative F because of the following: Regarding ORV usage, it is the most restrictive of the alternatives. From the NPS own reports, restrictive ORV routes not only don't work, they have the opposite effect. In 2009, the number of Piping Plover and Oystercatcher chicks fledged was down from the previous year by 1 and 3 chicks respectively. Although ORV routes in the late spring and summer of 2008 were restricted under the "consent Decree", the spring nesting had already begun. 2009 is the first full year by which comparisons can be made. 2007 nesting season (without ORV restrictions) was the most successful Plover breeding season in over 20 years. Please allow common sense to prevail and return the ORV management to Alternative A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 12:58:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area. I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 13:18:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 13:18:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 13:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe the Coalition to Preserve Beach Access position sums up the feeling of many vacation in the Cape Hatteras area. I am a lover of the outdoors and enjoy nature's beauty but I do not believe the path the Sierra Club and other organizations are taking is in the best interest of anyone. These organizations seem to believe that nature is best observed from my TV rather than letting citizens out into the environment.  
Thank you

**Correspondence ID:** 831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 13:50:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of a permit system managed by the Park Service which would protect endangered wildlife but also provide access to the public on a limited basis. I used to go to Ocracoke and fish in the surf, but it has become so crowded it is not as enjoyable. I would like to see a program where a permit could be applied for a certain area of beach, ex. Ocracoke island, or from ramp x to ramp y. The number of vehicles could be kept to a limit by doing this, but the public could still use and enjoy the area.

**Correspondence ID:** 832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I visit the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park at least once or twice a year, and the reason for my visits is to observe wildlife, specifically birds of Outer Banks. It concerns me greatly to think that this unique assemblage of species will be threatened by the selfish demands of a very small but vocal group of citizens -- the ORV users who insist on the ability to drive anywhere they want, any time they want, regardless of the danger to both wildlife and other citizens who prefer to enjoy the beach on foot.  
When I visit the Cape Hatteras area, I'm not alone. I lead trips for college students and people in the Piedmont who are interested in birds. Without the diversity of birdlife found on Hatteras Island and vicinity, these trips would not happen.  
I feel that there are issues of safety, of equal access for citizens with different interests, and of wildlife conservation that are all on the table here. It seems obvious to me that only Alternative D, modified to provide greater pedestrian access, addresses these three issues correctly and reasonably.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The various creatures that seek refuge and nesting sites here may also be "outsiders" but they are citizens of the world. Their continued presence is vital to environments far from our shores - vital to us.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
Have you seen the Ken Burns series "National Parks"? We should not squander the opportunities this seashore offers for the citizens of the east coast to learn the value of wild places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:48:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:48:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:48:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:48:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:48:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:48:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:48:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:48:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:48:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
I have seen the effects of ORV's on beaches throughout the South -- especially north Florida, where law enforcement is only sporadic and ORV's are abundant. From what I can tell, it doesn't matter what's on the beach -- baby birds, sea turtles, thriving plants, anything -- because somebody on an ATV will run it over with barely a look. You really, really, need to put nature above recreation in this case.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 844    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 14:49:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 845    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 15:04:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My grandparents operated the Avon Pier in the 1960's when all there was to do was fish both from the pier and by the surf. It has become a tradition for many families to travel to the outer banks for some of the best fishing memories that could ever be recorded. I know wildlife preservation is equally important. I do not support closing the beaches to ORV's or pedestrian traffic under any circumstances. There is plenty of room for both humans and wildlife historically and now. There was similar conversation back in the 60's regarding these types of issues and it drastically impacted the economy. As a result, my grandparents had to seek other avenues for financial support. I wished that Avon could go back to what it was in the 1960's when spending the summer with my grandparents was truly what a vacation should be.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 846    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Love, Melody L  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 15:28:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In regards to ORV's allowed on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and parts therein...I am afraid people are the one's deeply suffering. The National Park Service is ill-equipped and seriously negligent (according to the local's who live & work in this area). They have been caught tampering with nests to manipulate closures. How can this be fair? The local Outer Banks economy is suffering even more than everyone else statewide. How can people expect to pay their property taxes & maintain life when they have no tourist income that they have relied upon for years? You have cut off their livelihood.  
I am handicapped so therefore the only way I can make it out to fish is with the use of 4-wheeled drive. If you ban driving on the beach, you will be essentially cutting me off from my favorite sport and place of solitude.  
I have no biology degree but I can read the reports listed and see their flaws...and there are many. This is not a conservationist issue...it is an issue of people wanting to implant a bird that is not native and should not be in this area. If someone loaded up trucks with feral cats & dogs and turned them loose on the Outer Banks...you would make great strides to exterminate them. Something that is not native should not be allowed to take up nest and breed for the sole purpose that it exists. Keep the beaches open as they had been way back in the past...when our tax dollars paid the Park Service to do just that....be a service to it's citizens and not the Beach Bird Police.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 847    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Barrett, David S  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 15:46:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a native of NC and I have fished the coast for 30 years. I had such an unpleasant experience last year (2009) due to excessive beach closures to ORV use that I have serious doubts about ever fishing the OBX again. I cannot believe that a few individuals have convinced the rest that ORV use has such a huge impact on beach birds. While I do think that some careless few have caused damage, I also think the whole picture needs to be examined. I might add that I spent quite a bit of money on house rental, fuel, fishing supplies, restaurants and other things while I was there. I brought an extended family of 8 and the lack of available fishing areas really spoiled things for us. I also want to add that fishing most areas requires ORV use to access with fishing gear, bait, coolers, etc. Please remove all ORV restrictions. Thank you for your consideration.  
David Barrett

---

**Correspondence ID:** 848    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 15:48:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

0008981

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27.2010 16:18:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I feel very strongly about this. The wildlife is the wealth of our land. Where do you think your great grandchildren would stand on this issue? This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
The majority of tourists to the NC shore are there for the chance to observe wildlife in their natural habitats and to enjoy the peace and beauty of the beach. It seems to me that to allow one group (ORV users) preferred treatment over another (shorebirds and those of us who treasure our natural landscapes) is a terrible way to manage our resources. Its time for all of us to start behaving like the stewards of the planet that we should be.  
Leslie Schoof

---

**Correspondence ID:** 851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gioielli, Lawrence  
**Received:** Apr.27.2010 16:34:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Preservation of our vital seashore area requires that we limit our human footprint to the greatest extent possible. Too much of our nation's seashore has been spoiled because of small development setback requirements and the use of ORVs. When considering the recreational use of any seashore area, the environment concerns must take priority over economic concerns. This is equivalent to putting scientific knowledge ahead of business concerns. Please limit the use of ORVs on the Outer Banks. We have already destroyed too much of our seashore heritage and now it is time to be good custodians of what is left of our natural shore areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.27.2010 16:43:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Not everyone who lives in the Outer Banks is a screaming redneck. There are those of us who believe it is imperative to protect endangered species. That said, I believe there should be some sort of CONTROLLED access to the beaches in the national park land. I personally have not driven on the beaches in years because they have been overwhelmed by morons driving drunk, playing redneck music at full volume, throwing beer cans and trash all over, waving confederate flags and generally behaving miserably. It is impossible to drive on the beaches to simply enjoy their quiet beauty or go

fishing. I would gladly sacrifice all of those yahoos for one turtle or bird.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
\* Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 17:18:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 17:51:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have traveled to the Outer Banks, specifically Ocracoke over 60 times in the past 21 years. My family has become avid surf fishermen and enjoy driving our ORV responsibly on the beach. I have seen the utmost respect for the environment by ORV drivers. Vacationers enjoying ORV travel on the beach are not destroying the environment, but enjoying it in a way that is respectful to nature. I would like to see a plan drawn up to include ORV driving based on REAL scientific facts, not on MADE-UP information by heavily funded special interest groups. Just because ORV traffic may not be appropriate for some national parks, does not mean ORV traffic should be banned or heavily curtailed on the Outer Banks National Seashore. Banning ORV travel would be devastating to the Ocracoke economy. Almost all of the people on the island depend on tourism, and fishing/ORV beach driving is what brings so many people to the island. Seven years ago I purchased a home on the island which I rent out to help pay the mortgage and be able to vacation there often. It has been more difficult to rent out my home due to the bad economy over the past year, I can't even imagine how banning ORV driving will affect our being able to rent out our home in the future. Banning ORV travel will affect the rental companies, homeowners, hotels, restaurants, shops, construction workers, maintenance workers... which in turn affects families raising children and caring for the elderly. Everything I have read, leads me to believe the ORV driving ban is being influenced by special interest groups that have no ties to the Outer Banks. These groups have an agenda and the money to fight for it, and they are not basing their push on REAL EVIDENCE, but on a philosophy not everyone agrees with. Please take the homeowners, businesses, vacationers and real scientific evidence into consideration when making a decision on ORV travel so that it has a positive impact on the people who live and vacation there. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 856    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 18:01:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,  
I disagree with the DEIS because it is simply not fair to the people. The buffers for piping plovers and non-endangered bird species are far too restrictive

and not based on peer reviewed science. The negative economic impact to Cape Hatteras is huge. Culture and customs of Cape hatteras are based on beach access and will be greatly affected by the preferred alternative F restrictions. The NPS needs to do the right thing and create a fair and balanced management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	857	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 18:02:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS, I disagree with the DEIS because it is simply not fair to the people. The buffers for piping plovers and non-endangered bird species are far too restrictive and not based on peer reviewed science. The negative economic impact to Cape Hatteras is huge. Culture and customs of Cape hatteras are based on beach access and will be greatly affected by the preferred alternative F restrictions. The NPS needs to do the right thing and create a fair and balanced management plan.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	858	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 18:03:03						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS, I disagree with the DEIS because it is simply not fair to the people. The buffers for piping plovers and non-endangered bird species are far too restrictive and not based on peer reviewed science. The negative economic impact to Cape Hatteras is huge. Culture and customs of Cape hatteras are based on beach access and will be greatly affected by the preferred alternative F restrictions. The NPS needs to do the right thing and create a fair and balanced management plan.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	859	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 18:03:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS, I disagree with the DEIS because it is simply not fair to the people. The buffers for piping plovers and non-endangered bird species are far too restrictive and not based on peer reviewed science. The negative economic impact to Cape Hatteras is huge. Culture and customs of Cape hatteras are based on beach access and will be greatly affected by the preferred alternative F restrictions. The NPS needs to do the right thing and create a fair and balanced management plan.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	860	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 18:03:19						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS, I disagree with the DEIS because it is simply not fair to the people. The buffers for piping plovers and non-endangered bird species are far too restrictive and not based on peer reviewed science. The negative economic impact to Cape Hatteras is huge. Culture and customs of Cape hatteras are based on beach access and will be greatly affected by the preferred alternative F restrictions. The NPS needs to do the right thing and create a fair and balanced management plan.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	861	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 18:03:26						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS, I disagree with the DEIS because it is simply not fair to the people. The buffers for piping plovers and non-endangered bird species are far too restrictive and not based on peer reviewed science. The negative economic impact to Cape Hatteras is huge. Culture and customs of Cape hatteras are based on beach access and will be greatly affected by the preferred alternative F restrictions. The NPS needs to do the right thing and create a fair and balanced management plan.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	862	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 18:03:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS, I disagree with the DEIS because it is simply not fair to the people. The buffers for piping plovers and non-endangered bird species are far too restrictive and not based on peer reviewed science. The negative economic impact to Cape Hatteras is huge. Culture and customs of Cape hatteras are based on beach access and will be greatly affected by the preferred alternative F restrictions. The NPS needs to do the right thing and create a fair and balanced management plan.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	863	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 18:18:39						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.						

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 18:22:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a Floridian I am outraged this proposal has even reached a discussion of true debate. Historically, as a state our citizenry, across political lines, oppose drilling off our shores. NO DRILLING! Of any kind. No exploratory, no testing, no "What if we put the rigs under the water so you can't see them?". Keep the tricks and slight of hand. We protect our Paradise. Provisionally, the consequences of lapses in constitution, China oil leak in the Great Barrier Reef and even more recently the tragedy in the Gulf off Louisiana stand as reminders. As we speak the oil in the Gulf is making its way closer to the National Refuge just off the coastline. It is an inevitability. They argue the science as if it could never happen. It happens all the time!!!!!! It only takes once to cause years of devastation. No DRILLING!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 865    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 18:48:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 866    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 19:05:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recently received the 810 page book on the National Park Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Although I have gone thru only 400 pages, I am appalled (to fill with dismay or horror or shock) by The National Park Service. This is an outright attack on the Citizens of North Carolina and any tourist that may visit the Outer Banks since 1937 and the years to follow. Suggesting or Limiting ORV Access (the state or quality of being approachable: accessibility) is also making it less fortunate for handicap visitors. I was Born in North Carolina (1946), a disabled Veteran- Three tours in Viet Nam 1965 thru 1969 I being single is Racial profiling since I am the only driver. For me to enjoy the Outer banks it is unquestionable for me to enjoy the Oceanside beach, if I am requested to only have a seat in the sand, is a National Park employee going to be accessible to drive my vehicle back to a parking area and then bring my vehicle back to me when I am ready to leave. With Million of visitors including the rapid explosion of Spanish only spoken visitors, I do not see any information on the DEIS available in Spanish, and not to instruct them is another Racial Profiling for lack of Spanish signage on the National Park Service area and any printed material by the National Park Service or the United States Government. All the Outer Banks Businesses, cannot count for income if the word gets out that The National Park Racial Profiles tourist and Native Born Citizens. I also oppose the suggested increase of up to 1000 meters for any Piping Plovers. I oppose closing ORV lanes and suggest if any Loggerhead Nesting Turtles be immediately move to a safer location from any astronomical tide (full Moon or North Easter Storm), reference- South Carolina- <http://www.follyturtles.com/> Beach Program, I enjoy seeing and keep a local update of the Turtle Protection, Sighting and Moving off Nesting eggs if in Harms way. I am also appalled for a Fine of \$ 150.00 if you are seen observing a Nesting Site. How can you educate our Next Generation if you cannot show them a visual inspection and markings of a Located Turtle Nest. I see a lot of Turtle Nest in North Carolina, South Carolina and Florida, no evidence of someone destroying a nest, if I was to observe any destroying of Nest, any National or State Park Official would be Notified. I oppose any Restriction for non endangered or none threatened species not on the National Park or Government List. Richard O. Charlotte, North Carolina

---

**Correspondence ID:** 867    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Russell, Kenny N  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 19:24:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 1) Why can't we regulate the number of ORV per square mile better. -create a ten day pass to non-locals sold only in tackle shops. -Dare and Currituck should be able to acquire year long passes for the same amount as the ten day pass. The pass should be looked at as a means to create funds to help solve the environmental situations we are dealing with right now. -those who use the beach to fish with nets and beach launched boats should not have to pay a dime. The struggle the waterman has now days to make ends meet is getting to the point that all our seafood will have to be shipped in just like our oil and steel.

2 ) Why is it that because tourists can't watch where they are going or follow our counties rules, our beach ramps are shut down? The ramp at Coquina is one of the most famous ones to be shut down each year because of irresponsible people.

-there is talk about expanding the parking lot size and creating more access for people to walk in a controlled way like rats on to the beach.

CASE TO LOOK AT

Assateague Island located south of Ocean City, Maryland developed a way to co-habitat with the animals environment being created and access for ORV created to go around (key word AROUND )that environment. On the right day the entire beach located from either OREGAN INLET to CAPE POINT could be closed due to the limited or poorly located access point, do to the new and predictable nesting sites that have been being tract over the last few years. -how is it that you feel that people walking on the beach could or would be less destructive in larger numbers than organized regulation of land and animal since we are mammals

3) How is it that with statistics stating that nest failure is predominately due to non-human interference, but the Autobon Society thinks that closing the beaches will increase the number of birds yet closing the beaches will in fact shut down our beaches, families, children, their education through loss of revenue tax dollars. That is more than any family who is grateful and proud to call the Outer Banks and the surrounding areas home can endure.

4) At what point (number of birds) do or would you say that your efforts could be called a success? Then what amendments would you add to open or loosen the restrictions of regulation to a successful co-habitation.

5) Why is it that the Autobon Society will spend an ungodly amount of money on closing beaches? Has Habitat Construction away from the human traffic been considered? Nature is to be nature.

6) The ORV closure states that the distraction is more detrimental to Turtle nesting. A possible solution could be instead of shutting the economy on the Outer Banks down by closing our beaches, Biology student internships could go 24/7 during the nesting season. I know this will work because there are documented reports on such matters. Marines have a slogan; Leave no man behind. Well, I guess you have forgotten that and the men, women, and children of the Outer Banks are being left behind in a slow economy as it is. Closures cut down on our tourist levels which is what our season economy strives on.

7) I am , or should I say used to be, a mate on a charter boat. A big part of the reason I am not going to be this year is the decrease in the number of people coming to the Outer Banks looking to fish on charter boats. That is a direct result of the beach closures that have taken place for the last two years. People don't spend all that money just to fish on a boat for one day, they also like to surf fish which is something they are prevented from doing with the closures. The fishermen and women that make up the fleets and serve our community can't keep their boats afloat without people coming to the area to fish. Without our beaches we are a few steps away from having to become some other kind of tourist destination such as Atlantic City which is not family oriented and nothing I want my children raised in.

I would love to hear responses from you or if I can answer any questions you may have please get in touch with me: Kenny Russell 252-216-7569

**Correspondence ID:** 868 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Cosby jr, Charles c

**Received:** Apr,27,2010 19:57:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have sent one response already.I own rental property on Ocracoke.I just started explaining to my wife about some of the rules about use of the beach by humans.She replied no one will want to come.I think her impression is correct.I have placed my home on the market on Ocracoke and am more determined to sell than before, even if I have to reduce the price.When you combine these rules that are weighted more in favor of the birds than the people who want to use the island you end up with an island that loses some of its appeal.It is unfortunate that all theses rules were put in place during the worse economic crisis since the great depression.It is rather ironic that the government though the judicial branch has been able to afford more protection to birds than our government has afforded its citizens in that wall street was unregulated.We also have a congress who failed to pass a public option for universal health care.It might be better to be a bird in this country than a person.Perhaps abandoning the island altogether and making it a bird sanctuary makes the most sense and takes away the confusion.My wife read this and said, it will not do any good to say these things and I know she is right.Nevertheless as one citizen speaking with a small voice who will fall among the other soon to be ignored voices it feels good to say what I feel even if it is not worth the paper it is written upon.

**Correspondence ID:** 869 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,27,2010 20:19:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 870 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Kovach, Deborah K

**Received:** Apr,27,2010 20:20:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to Alternative F and support the Coalition for Beach Access position, with respect to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Draft.

I am opposed to Alternative F. I do not understand the justification for the restrictiveness of this proposal. I support the Coalition for Beach Access Proposal.

Sincerely,

Deborah Kovach Store Management Kitty Hawk Kites

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	871	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Kovach, Bradley A				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 20:22:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am opposed to Alternative F and support the Coalition for Beach Access position, with respect to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Draft. I am opposed to Alternative F. I do not understand the justification for the restrictiveness of this proposal. I support the Coalition for Beach Access Proposal. Sincerely, Bradley Kovach Project Manager BD&A Realty & Construction				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	872	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Kovach, Trevor A				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 20:24:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am opposed to Alternative F and support the Coalition for Beach Access position, with respect to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Draft. I am opposed to Alternative F. I do not understand the justification for the restrictiveness of this proposal. I support the Coalition for Beach Access Proposal. Sincerely, Trevor Kovach Warehouse Kitty Hawk Kites				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	873	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Kovach, Chelsea R				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am opposed to Alternative F and support the Coalition for Beach Access position, with respect to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Draft. I am opposed to Alternative F. I do not understand the justification for the restrictiveness of this proposal. I support the Coalition for Beach Access Proposal. Sincerely, Chelsea Kovach College Student Chowan University				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	874	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Harris, LaCreause T				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 20:26:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am opposed to Alternative F and support the Coalition for Beach Access position, with respect to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Draft. I am opposed to Alternative F. I do not understand the justification for the restrictiveness of this proposal. I support the Coalition for Beach Access Proposal. Sincerely, LaCreause Harris Retired Child Care Provider				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	875	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 21:18:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	876	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,27,2010 21:50:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if				

0008987

not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've never been to Hatteras, but when I do, I would like to see it the way it is now and experience things the best way I can. I read a lot about it in surfing magazines and it holds a dear place in my heart since I am a transplanted East Coaster.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 878    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Harley, Genevieve  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 23:08:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 879    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 01:49:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
Please put protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore first, and design recreational around this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 880    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tomins, Elmars J  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 06:52:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello, My name is Elmars Tomins. I live in Cary,NC. I go to the seashore a few times a year. I don't fish, I don't own a business or have any financial interests there. I simply want to be able to enjoy our coast. The concept of no people on the seashore for the sake of the birds makes me question what in the world is going on? Is the situation so dire that we must now ban people from our coastline - ORV or not? Please keep our beaches OPEN to people and ORV's. It is embarrassing for me to tell people that I know in other states and countries about what is going on regarding seashore access in North Carolina. Sincerely, Elmars Tomins Cary, North Carolina

---

**Correspondence ID:** 881    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 07:58:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir, The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is an area for all people, not special interest groups. The decision to close and limit access to beach driving is based on emotional response and not scientific fact. Driving on the beach has always been restricted to the sand and not the dunes, which would not effect the shore bird population regardless.  
The Plover and the Oyster catcher are not a species that is endangered and thrives in areas not related to Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area and there is no proof that the plovers have ever nested or bred there in the past. The all-out assault against natural predators with daily tallies posted for all to see seems to be ignored by the special interest groups; why is that? The special interest groups must not care about any other creatures that naturally inhabit the Cape Hatteras National Recreational area. There is evidence that the presence of humans on the beaches aides in the deterence of natural predators; this is significant.  
Closing the beaches because of nesting turtles could be better served by close monitoring rather that wholesale closing of the beaches. The turtle studies personnel know, to the day, when turtles hatch and closing the beaches for a few days for that purpose only would seem to be more appropriate.  
I have never seen nor heard the special interest groups support the beaches for anything other than their own interests. The OBPA, NCBBA, and the Cape Hatteras Anglers Club continually support efforts to clean the beaches, provide community support, and promote conservation of the Outer Banks. It is appalling, that for the benefit of the few, the whole must suffer. By closing or severely limiting the beach access, the special interest groups have deprived the local business's from their livelihood. These business's depend on the fishermen and tourists for thier income. It is apparent that special interest groups do not care, as is evident from closed stores and the economic downturn due to lack of visitors. It is also of concern that the National Parks system condones and bows to special interest groups and does not consider the whole picture.  
As a long time visitor to the outerbanks(35years) it concerns me greatly that emotion and special interest groups will deprive future generations of the beauty and recerational opporunities provided by the Outer Banks. Recend the driving ban and practice conservation to peserve this area for generations

to come.  
Respectfully submitted, Harry W. Anderson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 882    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Windsor, Matt H  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 08:03:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I write this as a natural resource manager and a lifetime resident of NC. I do not make these comments as an official representative of the state agency I work for, nor do my opinions necessarily represent the opinions of my employing agency. I managed a state recreation area with a similar beach access and ORV plan and I learned to drive on the beach at Ocracoke Island. I can completely understand the longstanding attachment to driving on the beach. However, 30 years ago there was not near the amount of traffic and visitation on the outer banks as there is today. There are some practices that cannot withstand the test of time and without regulation will compromise the natural resources that we enjoy. Beach driving is a practice that needs to be left behind in the last century. Working on the coast I have talked to a great many people from across the nation who think we are nuts to allow vehicles on our beaches. I enjoy fishing on the beach and I and my family have been disturbed by the actions of beach drivers. For every responsible beach driver there is another wanting to see what his vehicle is capable of. There is a profound damage to the resource from beach driving. If off road driving was allowed in the great smoky mtns NP or in fields along the Blue Ridge Parkway there would be a national outcry. There are a vocal group of merchants and beach drivers that will never stop advocating for absolute unbridled access to beach driving. These are the same interests who would develop every square inch of the outer banks if there was a dollar to be made. This is a national park, not a county rec. area and I am concerned that these meetings (other than possibly the one in Raleigh) do not represent the wishes of the nation's visitors to this outstanding scenic and biological area. The Outer Banks beaches at one time used to all be as beautiful as Portsmouth Island or Shackleford banks but in the heavily driven areas they are covered in cigarette butts, shreds of mudflaps, and trash. The beach driving groups do pick up a lot of trash, much of it that washes up from boats. The Outer Banks should be designated as a wilderness area like Shackleford Banks. The people up in arms about losing tourism dollars are promoting a brand of tourism that is unsustainable- it is based on packing as many people into an environmentally fragile yet dynamic area as possible. If you are dead set on allowing vehicle traffic, I would only allow it in the fall and the winter after bird and turtle nesting season is over. The majority of beach drivers in the summer months are not there to fish, they are there to drink, avoid walking on the beach, and so they can haul as much gear as possible to the remotest beach they can reach, completely defeating the purpose of it being a national park. Just call it a national parking lot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 883    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hoye, James M  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 08:04:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am 69 years and have been visiting the Outer Banks of North Carolina since was a child. At present I will average three to four visits a year which includes a extended family vacation[about 20 people]. We very much enjoy being able to drive on the beach,swimming,fishing and just relaxing. Our visits and not only enjoyable for us they help the local economy and the North Carolina. I understand that we must have some rules and regulations to protect the environment but I cannot how closing off the beach access is going to help any endangered wildlife, just the opposite will be true. The taxes provided by a thriving local economy help provide that protection, sustain the wildlife and maintain the beaches. I move to central Virginia in 1962. The white tail deer and wild turkey population was low. Primarily due to the management efforts of the Virginia Game Commission and user fees,license, and taxes the population of both and thriving Surely a plan can be developed that will allow my children and grandchildren to be able to drive on the beaches and to enjoy the Outer Banks as much as I have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 884    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 08:08:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello. I have been a regular visitor to the Outer Banks with my family (Buxton, Frisco, Hatteras Village, Ocrokoke) for the past 25 years. I am an avid fisherman and my preference is to drive my SUV on the beach and surf fish. I am sure that I have had a huge impact on the economy of the lower Outer Banks in my lifetime.  
The reason that I drive 6-7 hours down to the outer banks is mainly because of the ease of getting all of my fishing gear onto the beach.  
I am also an avid environmentalist. Most of the fishermen that I have met in the Outer Bank are also avid environmentalists. In all of my years fishing at Cape Point, Hatteras inlet, Billy Mitchell area and Ocracoke Island I have never come in contact with one of the nesting birds.  
I urge the decision makers to re-think the closing off of the best fishing spots in the world to vehicle traffic. If these areas are closed off I will be forced to take my vacation dollars elsewhere. If I am going to have to park my truck and haul all of my fishing gear several hundred yards in order to fish, I can do that at any other beach on the east coast of the United States without having to drive 6-7 hours.  
When making important decisions like closing off these fishing areas, I hope that you will consider how this will impact the economy of the lower Outer Banks. Think of all the property owners who will be forced into foreclosure. Think of all the stores and restaurants who will be forced to close their doors.  
Thanks for listening to my comments and please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss further.  
Sincerely, Steve Combs 301-933-3429

---

**Correspondence ID:** 885    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 08:08:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam, I have read the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. The plan has is a cause for great concern. I believe the steps outlined in the plan, specifically closing beaches for a 1,000 meters in all directions to preserve specific bird nesting sites, are draconian and unnecessary in the extreme. According to the draft plan, human activities only account for 3% of nest disturbances. Closing the beaches will have a negligible impact in fostering protected species. I also do not fully understand the restriction on having leashed dogs on the beach. This restriction appears to be both gratuitous and arbitrary. I would like to point out that closing the beaches will have a massive detrimental impact on property owners in the area. I own two beach houses and we operate them as a business. We depend on the income from our summer rentals to pay the debt on these houses. At the same time, we employ numerous people both directly and indirectly to care for the houses and maintain them. If the measures outlined in the plan are adopted, our business in the Outer Banks will be jeopardized. We may well be driven into bankruptcy. I believe the plan is based on unsound science, flawed assumptions and greatly underestimates the negative consequences of the plan. The fact that only two paragraphs out of a total of 810 pages are devoted to the economic impact of the plan speaks for itself. Thank you for you attention to this matter. Alex Keto

---

**Correspondence ID:** 886    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gordon, Greg  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 08:22:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the Hatteras beaches open to vehicles. As a surfer, I am aware of the value of our coastal ecosystem and our need to protect it. Surfrider has

worked for years to keep the beaches clean and keep them open to the public to enjoy as a natural form of recreation. When you love your beach, you work to protect it and keep it clean.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 887    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.28,2010 08:45:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras Management Team, As a long term solution there should be no driving on the beach however this is Hatteras so it's as natural to drive on the beach as it is to look over your shoulder and see the lighthouse! Having commented on that if the lighthouse was not relocated and whereby managed accordingly it may have been taken by Mother Ocean never to be seen again (until maybe the construction of another). Super project guys and well done! I'm confident the RIGHT laws will be passed limiting the off road traffic to certain designated sections of the region. I can't imagine not seeing the fishing crowd out on the point so that'll be an absolute mandatory section, maybe one way in & out? Same for the vast other possible sections of even just Buxton, one way on the beach, one way off the beach. It's apparent not everyone will be pleased and happy about the regulation but it's a solid step in the direction of future preservation of natural seashore life. If it disappears it can't be reconstructed so please manage it accordingly.  
 Respectfully,(NC land owner) Steve Stillman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 888    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** austin, elwood r  
**Received:** Apr.28,2010 08:51:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i wish and hope that you(nps) can find a way to keep our beaches open to the people of our country. my name is raymond austin, born in buxton 1956, there are not many natives left. so ; if you keep cape point,hatteras inlet,orgen inlet,and ocracoke inlet open then we natives can survive.we also are a die bread.i would hope that our children could be raised up here and enjoy a piece of freedom like so many before us have enjoyed. its good for the young to see the beautiful island as it is, they walk and talk about our beaches all over the world. as a merchant marine,traveling the world, of heard many peoples say they take trips here to fish,and enjoy the history of these islands, or bring there kids here to play on these beaches,so if theres going to be closers, please concenter only off seasons, we all depend on tourist for our livelihood. theres allways a soultion to the problems that we face each day. your an american also, reach deep in your hearts and have mercy. thank you. raymond austin,hatteras nc 27943

---

**Correspondence ID:** 889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wheless, Karen S  
**Received:** Apr.28,2010 09:02:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 4/28/10  
 To Whom It May Concern:  
 I stand in support of HR 718. As a long time North Carolina resident, and current property owner in Avon, NC, I have enjoyed, and hope to continue to enjoy this treasured area National Seashore and Recreation Area at Cape Hatteras NC, along with other Americans and the general public, for years to come. That is why I am making this public comment.  
 NPS closures due to birds and turtles have been historically satisfactory and the science is there to prove it. This recent action is unwarranted.  
 Coalition for Beach Access DEIS Assessment: \* Pedestrian/ORV Routes -Most Restrictive Ever \* Closures Due to Birds -Most Restrictive Ever \* Closures Due to Turtles -Most Restrictive Ever \* Night Driving -Most Restrictive Ever \* Pet Activities -Most Restrictive Ever \* Benefits to Resources -Negligible \* Impairment to Visitor Experience -Major \* Impairment to Local Economy -Major  
 As members of OBPA, my husband David and I share in the beliefs outlined by OBPA, that the very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 800 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.  
 Why does the DEIS ignore the traditional cultural importance of surf zone access to Outer Banks communities? These published criteria clearly define the traditional use and cultural value of the Outer Banks surf zone.  
 NPS Guidelines state: "A Traditional Cultural Property designation can and should be based on patterns of land use that reflect cultural traditions valued by the long term residents of the local community."  
 NPS Guidelines state: "A landscape can also constitute Traditional Cultural Property if it is a location where a community has traditionally carried out economic or other cultural practices important in maintaining its historic identity."  
 The DEIS describes ORV access as historical in nature (pg. 83) and also both predating the Seashore and as being integral to the public use by both residents and visitors. The document also illustrates and captions historical commercial fishing (pg.18), historical recreational fishing (pgs. 15, 260) and historical general recreational activities (pg. 259).These same traditional cultural activities are featured on the front cover.  
 The surf zone has long been not just a location for traditional economic activities such as surf dory seine net fishing but also other cultural activities as well. These include general beach recreation activities, social gatherings, weddings, funerals and hook and line recreational/subsistence fishing. Collectively these activities are components of an unbroken pattern of land use that extend back many generations before the establishment of the Seashore and remain integral to the fabric of the historically unique Outer Banks communities. Further yet, the continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of these same communities. Why has the NPS failed to appropriately address the traditional cultural value of surf zone access? The NPS failure stands in direct violation of its legal responsibility under Section 106 of the NEPA and the NEPA framework as a whole.  
 The socioeconomic data and analyses in the DEIS (pg 270-281;561-598) result in misleading and sometimes erroneous conclusions. Critical weaknesses in the analyses pertain to: 1) statistical definition of the Region of Influence (ROI); 2) incomplete visitation/business survey data (p.566); 3) erroneous recreational user data; 4) inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use; and 5) flawed key assumption concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F. These flaws are directly manifested in both the Effected Environment and Socioeconomic Impact sections of the DEIS.  
 Region of Influence (ROI):  
 The ROI incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore  
 Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages  
 Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts  
 Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.  
 Incomplete Data on Visitation/Business Surveys:  
 Economic analyses in the DEIS do not use data from the first full year of the Consent Decree (2009).  
 Many 2008 visitors were either unaware of the scope and breadth of Consent Decree beach closures, or had already made plans/reservations  
 Actual business survey data rather than model projections for economic impact for Seashore Villages businesses are not available in DEIS Overall Visitor Counts Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial.  
 A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are

predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

**Summary:**

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

Feel free to make this public comment available to all. If there are questions, please feel free to contact me at:  
Karen Wheless 103 Ransdell Road Louisburg, NC 27549 Phone: 919-818-9019 Email: ksw4obx@gmail.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
For the past twenty-three years I (and my staff) have monitored Piping Plovers, terns, and oystercatchers for the Massachusetts Audubon Society, the National Audubon Society, and/or the Goldenrod Foundation. I have conducted studies and reviewed the literature on all aspects of human impacts to beach-nesting and migratory species of shorebirds. This experience leads me to conclude that any off-road vehicle use in the beach habitats of these birds harms these species of birds, diminishes the quality and quantity of their habitats, and in general alters the natural processes at play in forming healthy, natural barrier beach ecosystems. To see detailed diagrams on how off-road vehicles damage these resources please see diagrams and other scientific literature available on my website: [www.goldenrod.org](http://www.goldenrod.org). Using the search bar type in off-road vehicle.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 891    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sholar, Jonathan D  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 09:38:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We as a family of 14 have been vacationing on the Outer Banks for the past 5 years. We stay on Hatteras Island. We started going to Hatteras instead of places like Myrtle Beach because we like to fish and the overall experience of being able to drive to remote locations like the Point and Hatteras Inlet. I have a few questions: (1. We as a family will not continue to vacation at the Outer Banks if NPS preferred plan, or worst, for access is put in place. We spend around \$10,000 with rental and local businesses each summer. We are only one family of many who fill this way. Why is this negative impact that will be felt by small businesses and villages not clearly addressed. (2. Why is there a 1000 meter buffer for pipping plover that is left in place based on were it was born. I think a smaller buffer that moves where the bird forages would be more logical. Instead of shutting down the beach completely there still could be corridors for vehicles to pass. (3. Why are non-endangered or non threatened species like the American Oystercatcher used to close more and more area each year? These birds flourish on the dredge and spoil islands which are in the same ecosystem as the RECREATIONAL AREA and are nor adequately considered by the NPS. (4. Why will the NPS not adopt a more proactive stance used by other east coast locations to encourage turtle nesting success?  
Jonathan Dwayne Sholar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 892    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 09:56:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a regular visitor to the Outer Banks and enjoy use of the beach including access via ORV. I am not in favor of adding more restrictions as I feel they are already quite limiting as is. Additional restrictions will be far more damaging to the fragile Outer Banks economy than any species. Therefore I recommend you adopt Alternative A or B and not impose any more new restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 893    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 10:12:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I just recently retired and live in Florida. I have vacationed and fished on Hatteras Island for the last 47 years and I have owned an oceanfront home in Frisco for the last 30 years. I am quite concerned about several proposals in the current document. We fish from the surf and do much of our Drum fishing at night. Your proposal to not allow night driving from May 1 thru Nov 15 (Page 104 of the document )and not allow ORV's between ramps 23 and 27, Hatteras Inlet, and Ocracoke Inlet (page 97 thru 101 of the document) effectively eliminates some of the best surf fishing beach anywhere in the world. In addition a 1000 meter pedestrian and ORV closure zone around Piping Plover nests and 300 meters around Oyster Catcher nests ( Page 121 thru 127 of the document )is far to large an area to close. In some parts of Hatteras island 1000 meters would run from the ocean to the sound! I also own a well trained Black Lab. Our dog goes everywhere we go, Sleeps at the foot of my bed and has never been in a kennel and never will be! Your

0008991

proposal to ban pets leashed or unleashed from March thru July 31st (page 136 of the document) is also wrong.

The proposed rules I have outlined above need to be eliminated or significantly modified. I also rent my property in Frisco and the above rules, if not changed, will keep surf fisherman away as well as pet lovers. This group of vacationers spend a lot of money and their loss as vacationers will hurt an already hurting economy on Hatteras Island. Also the large beach closures, due to nesting birds, will also start to chase away the prime time vacationers if they cannot access the beach in front of a house they are paying big dollars to rent !!!

I currently reside in Englewood Florida and on the gulf beaches here there are similar concerns for nesting turtles and birds. In this area the nests are roped off with signs, approx 20 feet in every direction, and dogs must be kept on a leash. There are fines for anyone that disturbs a nest. This solution is working while still allowing vacationers to access the beach.

Please modify these items as I fear that once the vacationers and Fishermen are lost it will be very difficult to get them back.

Bruce Bridenbaker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	894	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Bautista, Heather				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.28.2010 10:13:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep the beach access open. My husband and I enjoy our weekend visits mainly because of the beach. We spend a lot of money in Hatteras, which helps the local economy. Our hopes are that we can continue to do so. Thank you. - Heather Bautista				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	895	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.28.2010 10:20:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. I personally treasure our National Parks for their ability to preserve habitat for endangered wildlife, especially birds. I also believe humans should be able to enjoy the parks and that there is great importance in fostering a widespread love and respect for nature and natural places. However, the interaction between humans and habitat should never impact wildlife in a negative way, and humans should follow the "leave no trace" model whenever possible. I would be in favor of eliminating ORV use across the board, as I can't see how their use is anything but disruptive. Therefore, I would ask that the Park Service move towards the alternative that is most favorable for wildlife, and always put the interests of wildlife ahead of those of humans. We have so much space at our disposal, there's no reason we can't selflessly give back a piece here and there. Thank you for listening.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	896	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, Amy				
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.28.2010 10:47:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please leave the beaches open for public driving access. It is one of the reasons we enjoy coming to the area. It would be a shame to take away this privilege...if it is taken away, it could end up being detrimental to the local economy.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	897	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.28.2010 11:31:18						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We own a home in Avon, NC. We agree with alternate F regarding the ban on pets between March 15th and July 31st (p136). Unfortunately, most pet owners do not obey the current leash regulations and do not clean up the poop. However, pedestrian access should NOT be prohibited between March 15th and July 31st(p131). This is a National Seashore Recreational Area. Limiting people access to the beach negates the original intent of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	898	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.28.2010 11:32:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	When is this debate going to end?						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	899	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.28.2010 11:36:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a critical breeding area for birds and sea turtles, and migratory and wintering bird habitat. Because of these wildlife activities, I urge you to please prohibit all vehicle use of the seashore. The two, vehicle traffic and necessary, year-round wildlife activities, are not compatible.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	900	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.28.2010 11:44:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I grew up surfing/fishing the Outer Banks. Killing access will kill the very nature of the roots and origins of the culture that defines the area. I am all for preservation but there is a way to do it right.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	901	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.28.2010 11:46:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern: What has happened at Cape Hatteras National Seashore and RECREATION AREA is a travesty to what this area was originally founded for. For years the people that have utilized this resource have successfully coexisted with the natural surroundings. Rules have been implemented without scientific						

fact, and without proper public notification. Not only has the sport fishing community been adversely impacted, but this mismanagement has also had negative impacts to the local economy.

Please reconsider what has been done. The consent decree was nothing more than a shotgun wedding. Let us involve everyone and put together a real plan (that is based on real scientific data and involves all persons affected) for the future of Cape Hatteras and the surrounding communities. Chuck Nance Rutherfordton, NC

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	902	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 11:54:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep the Hatteras beach access available. It's one of the reasons my family and friends schedule vacations there. It is a great get away to hit the beach and be able to ride along the beach to find our spot and enjoy the surf and sand together. Last year we only made one trip down because the beach access was limited and then was closed all together. We hope that the access will be available so that we can make many trips down this year.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	903	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 12:29:31						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am 43 and have been going to Cape Hatteras since I was a baby camping with my grand parents and parents. Since I have had a drivers license I would travel to hatteras and drive on the beach to Fish ,surf or just enjoy the beach with out major commercialization . Normally we go in the spring -Fall every other week end Last year when the beaches closed to Driving we did not even go. Most of my friends have said the same. We always spend money in hatteras at the restaurants,stores and for lodging. I think closing the beaches will greatly affect the economy of the town that totally relies on the tourist industry. I know if the beaches remain open to driving we will be there every other weekend if they close we will not go there at all. Thank you for listening!!!! R. bautista						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	904	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 13:20:35						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	905	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	stevenson, marvin g						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a life long visitor to the Outer Banks, Cape Hatteras Island, in particular. I have been extremely disappointed in the way the beach access issue has been handled in the last 2 years. The "environmental" groups that have hijacked the entire process and abused the courts to impose their agenda on an area of great interest to all citizens, residents and tourists alike has damaged the local economy and culture far more than any hurricane or natural disaster has ever affected it. The closing of numerous small businesses and tourism based businesses is concrete evidence of that. These groups have used draconian measures to over regulate and deprive tax paying citizens of the right to access some of the most desirable recreational areas on the east coast for little or no benefit to the environment or wildlife. Virtually all of these actions have been taken with no input from the very people who support the National Park Service and in such a manner as to make it impossible to affect a fare and reasonable outcome. It's a blatant example of too much power being awarded to too few special interests. If you are trying to foment disrespect for the park service and environmentalism you have succeeded on a grand scale. Glenn Stevenson / Stevenson Uniform Service Inc.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	906	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 13:56:48						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern, I have just returned from a one week vacation in Cape Hatteras NC with 4 others from Canada. We were there to participate in surfing and kite surfing along the sea shore and sound. It was apparent to us that the local outdoor enthusiasts are very concerned about proposed limitations to the use of the sea shore. I admit I have not read in detail the lengthy document detailing alternative proposed plans to sea shore access. It is clear to me however that several local residents of the outer banks are concerned that access to the sea shore may be limited by these plans. I wish to offer my support to those who strive to keep the sea shore open. The OBX shore line is a magnificent natural wonder that can be enjoyed in a non destructive fashion. Most of the use of the shore line is, as far as I can see, low impact activities such as surfing, swimming, kite surfing, etc. Participants in these sports are generally very attentive to the environmental impact of their use of natural resources. The OBX attracts thousands of						

tourists to the area from all over the world. It is one of the cleanest areas I have had the pleasure to visit. North Carolina should be proud of its care and maintenance of the region.

I hope that those considering this plan give weight to the continued and future enjoyment of this shore line by outdoor enthusiasts, both from within the US and beyond. Limiting access to either the ocean or sound side would be a great loss to water sport enthusiasts, as well as the local economy.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	907	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 14:07:07						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support reasonable access to the shoreline by means of ORV in Cape Hatteras. I would support a plan that is flexible and reasonable in its identification and management of areas that may have nesting migratory birds and other wildlife but would not ban access altogether. I would hope the Service would implement a plan that is narrowly tailored and is no broader than necessary in protecting such wildlife but be tailored to not be overly burdensome on recreational activities which, in large part, depend on ORV access. Thanks, Mike Tinyk						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	908	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 14:19:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is a bad. You will kill much income to the state as well as a perfectly environmentally friendly sport. I am going to be short. Please don't do this. I hope you come to your senses.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	909	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 14:20:39						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	910	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Cox, Jason						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 14:29:24						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Comment Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan I disagree with subject plan. I am a life long vacationer to the Outer Banks, Cape Hatteras Island in specific. I am extremely disappointed in the way the beach access has been handled. I will be very upset if our ( group of 5 - 7 people) annual kiteboarding vacation to the Outer banks is effected in a negative way. The current beach access is the only reason why we chose this destination as our number one vacation spot over VA and FL. Mark my words, Tourism from Canadian visitors WILL suffer greatly! Jason from Quebec Canada.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	911	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 15:17:38						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is a national seashore created FOR THE PEOPLE and is not a wildlife refuge. Beach drivers will respect nests after they are identified and posted. The beach should NOT BE POSTED because of suitable habitat, but only for identified actual nests. Turtles are not a problem due to the location of their nests. Birds can and do nest adjacent to the highway so beach traffic does not disturb their site choices. Please give us back our beach.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	912	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 15:20:45						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:						

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 913    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 15:56:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As with any public land, users should act responsibly, and be sensitive to the local habitat. Those who don't should be dealt with accordingly. This is an ancient code of conduct, and remains true to this day. Why should those of us that act responsibly be punished to compensate for those who don't?! Enforce existing rules, laws, and regulations, and don't create new ones when you can't!! --WILL RICHMOND

---

**Correspondence ID:** 914    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 16:20:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 915    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 16:23:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i am no longer live on the east Coast but if my entry helps to save the Hatteras than here it is. here in texas we say don't mess with texas well same to the hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 916    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 16:47:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please Please do not close access to the Beaches of North Carolina.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 917    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 16:50:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 918    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 17:20:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 919    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 18:21:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
My husband and I use North Carolina beaches every summer. Since 1990 on our first trip, we have noticed more and more vehicles on the beach. This has caused significant damage in many areas, and we feel this should be corrected.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 920    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 18:51:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 921    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

I am a long-time, repeated visitor to the Hatteras area. I go as often as I can because of the national seashore and the wildlife it protects. The wild places are what makes the entire area worth driving to rather than going to a place like Myrtle Beach or Wilmington. The national seashore is one of the most visited national parks in the world. It is the collective property of everyone in the United States. It is the most beautiful stretch of beach in the world. It draws tourists from around the world to see species that have been wiped out at other places that lack the protective status of the national seashore.

Thus, the rules of the national park should prioritize keeping the environment pristine so that the long-term economic, environmental, and social interests of our state and country are preserved. All of the whiner arguments about access to fishing are short-sighted. I love fishing too, but not if my truck destroys endangered wildlife habitat. I could just as well go to Myrtle beach to drive on the dunes.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 19:21:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 923    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 19:58:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please leave kiteboarding legal in on cape hatteras! This is the whole reason we go to Hatteras. This is a unique playground which we respect. Tourism will be greatly effected if kiteboarding is ban in this area.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	924	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 20:05:20						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a longtime visitor to the Outerbanks, I feel it is necessary that I voice my opinion regarding the proposed changes. I support a balanced approach to managing our wildlife and the recreational use of National Parks. I do not support prohibiting access to our beaches.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	925	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Raper, Connie K						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 20:16:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area. I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come. Thank you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	926	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Elliott, Lynn M						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 20:17:01						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area. I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come. Thank you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	927	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	DOBROTH, DALE						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 20:29:08						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	THE RESTRICTIONS BEING PROPOSED WILL PREVENT THE RECREATIONAL USER OF THIS WONDERFUL AREA FROM ENJOYING THE NATURAL AMENITIES THE PROTECTION OF THE BIRDING HABITAT IS FAR TOO EXTREME THE BIRDS MIGRATE & CAN EASILY FIND ALTERNATIVE HABITAT WHILE IT MAY APPEAR TO BE THE TYPE OF RESTRICTION THAT IS NEEDED TO A CONSERVATIONIST MANY TIMES THESE ITEMS BACKFIRE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTED ALL SORTS OD DRAINAGE CONTROLS IN FLORDIA ONLY TO FIND OUT 40 YEARS LATER WHAT A BIG MISTAKE THEY MADE & HOW EXPENSIVE IT IS TO CORRECT. DO NOT APPROVE THE PROPOSED RESTRICTIONS THANK YOU						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	928	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Penen, Christian M						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 20:49:41						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I disagree with the proposed solutions for restricting access of large areas of the park to the public. As an avid kite-surfer, Cape Hatteras is a kite-surfing mecca. People from all over the world visit this location for this reason alone. Those travelers boost the local economy and make Cape Hatteras a kite-surfing icon. Restricting access will force potential tourists to go to other places such as Cabarete in the Dominican Republic which is well known for their kite-surfing. California already suffers from a lack of funding and if this passes it will make North Carolina more like California.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	929	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 20:51:18						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are						

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, Tracey  
**Received:** Apr.28,2010 21:46:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Superintendent,

I had an opportunity to speak at the public meeting in Raleigh today. Thank you. I spoke on behalf of my children, ages 3 and 5. I spoke about how they love the beach house. I spoke how my children wouldn't know the beach unless we went to Hatteras. I spoke of finding hidden treasure and ship wrecks that my children wouldn't otherwise see because of limited access. I spoke from my heart. I spoke for my children. I spoke for my son who wished me luck and told me on the way out the door to come and speak, "mommy when your done can we go to the beach?" But I didn't say what I had intended to say. Mr. Superintendent, I simply request that that beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore remain open for all. The NPS does its job to protect its resources and wildlife. Pea Island exists as a refuge for birds. The birds have a designated space. Additionally the Park Rangers do their best by putting up buffers for birds and turtles. Let the people have free and open access. It's also our beach to enjoy. We have witnessed the rangers in action. We saw some commotion on Cape Point one morning, as we were looking for a spot to enjoy. My husband stopped the truck and talked to some folks standing around. We found out there was an injured turtle trying to get to shore and the NPS was keeping people back so the turtles could find their way. We hung around for a while and watched. We never saw anything exciting, but we sure had a very inquisitive 4 year old asking us questions. "Mommy what happened to the turtle? How did it get hurt? What are those people doing? Is the turtle going to be OK? How big is the turtle? What kind of turtle is it?" For the rest of the weekend we talked about turtles and how we should respect them, and take care to leave them alone so they can do what nature does best. We talked about the turtle nesting areas and why it is important to obey the signs and stay outside the area the NPS has roped off. Now at age 5, I listen to him explain to his now 3 year old sister about the turtle nesting areas. We would never had that experience, or such an impactful conversation at such a young age if we weren't able to access and drive on the beach. We discover so much through our children. Our children discover so much by being kids and enjoying the beach. My kids are all about Cape Hatteras. Both times I was pregnant we visited Hatteras and Cape Point. Our favorite spot though is the ramp just north of Avon. At 8 months pregnant it was so awesome to be able to drive on the beach, relax in the salt air, feel the sand on my feet, and be happy! I didn't have to worry about waddling out on the beach over a boardwalk, through the sand, carrying a chair, water, towels, food, and a cell phone at 8 months pregnant. I could load up in the truck, go to the beach and enjoy. I didn't even have to get out of the truck, which was good because it was December, and cold. It is nice to be able to drive on the beach in the winter, in the warmth of your vehicle and watch: watch the birds, the waves, the fog roll in, the wind blow the sand, the salt mist form on the windshield. The beach changes each moment right before our eyes. It is peaceful. When my children were born they each visited Hatteras within the first month of life. They don't remember but that was each of their first vacation. Five and three years later it is their favorite place on earth. As my kids have grown we explore new adventures on the island. We have followed the ruts formed by other vehicles pretending we were trains. We race in them pretending we are race cars. We go so fast that we fall. We fall into the soft sand. Oh, to be three years old again. We play Black Beard, pretending we are pirates looking for buried treasure. We play princess, after we build big sand castles. We go fishing and catch "hundreds of croaker". My son was so amazed that you could even hear them croak. We showed them a shipwreck only accessible by truck because it would have been too long a walk for a small child. We have picked up more smooth shiny rocks than sea shells because the rocks are better, and most of the seashells are too small or broken. We have watched the fisherman reel in big fish and small sharks. We have scouted for shark teeth and horseshoe crab shells. We jump over the small white water as it rushes up on shore. We watch daddy surf on the waves and look forward to the day when the kids can surf. We end some evenings by relaxing by a camp fire and roasting hotdogs for dinner. The adventures are endless because each time we go to the beach it is always different, yet peacefully it's the same beach that we have always enjoyed. Recently my family participated in North Carolina Big Sweep at the park that I work at for the Town of Cary. We picked up so much trash around our lake. My children felt proud to be a part of cleanup. We talked about how we were saving the ducks, squirrels, turtles, rabbits, deer and other wildlife. When we visit the National Seashore they see trash and want to pick it up. Sometimes we pick it up and carry it back with us. Driving down Highway 12 to Avon we pass through Pea Island. We see so many birds. We have stopped a couple of times and walked the trail. We talk about the birds, where they go to sleep, what they eat, where they fly, why do they come here; again inquisitive kids make for teachable moments. Pea Island is for the birds. Why close so much of the beach? I spoke after my mother tonight in Raleigh. She took me to Cape Hatteras as a child and now she has the opportunity to still create memories in Hatteras with me, and now also her grandkids. She said something that struck a chord with me tonight in her address to you. She doesn't want her grandkids to see Cape Hatteras through a book. After experiencing it first hand, to take it away from them would be devastating. To only experience it through a book is disheartening. Imagine, the smell of the book, the feel of the paper, the sound of the crisp pages turning, the beauty of a sunset 10 years ago with the sun glistening off the grassy dunes. Now, imagine the smell of the ocean, the feel of the cool sand and water, the sound of the waves crashing on the shore, the sound of birds in the distance, the breeze blowing down the beach, and the sun glistening golden off the sea oats as the sun sets over the dunes. Which would you rather experience: Sea Oats or a picture of brown grass on a dune? Paper or Sand? Cool refreshing ocean breeze or your AC? I know my children learn more from visiting Cape Hatteras about how the world works than they do at home seeing pictures of the ocean in a book. I speak for my children who would be deprived of the teachable moments that arise from each visit to the National Seashore. Please keep our beaches open so that my children and children of all ages (we are all children when we go to Cape Hatteras) can enjoy, learn and appreciate nature!

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of my children who would most likely only ask, "Why".

Sincerely,

Tracey Filomena and my two kids.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
Wildlife, in my opinion, is not a suitable driving surface. With smaller carapace surface area than an ATV/ORV, sea turtles and other crustaceans stand a smaller chance of survival than humans. As such, unless the creatures are provided with said vehicles to enable their coexistence with humans, they should be allowed to carry on their biological tasks without being flattened by unobservant humans. At last count, the planet had several billion humans, I think that alone is sufficient evidence that wildlife needs all of the help it can get.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan:  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
All the best!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lytle, Denise  
**Received:** Apr.28,2010 23:47:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
 I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:21:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bunton, Stuart  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 01:04:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The only reason I even care to know about Cape Hatteras is because I'm an avid kiteboarder who comes for the wind. Closing beaches for migratory species does not make any sense at all. May common sense prevail! The land of the free is fast becoming the land of the free to be ruled.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 01:21:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 936 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bua, Jimmy  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 02:39:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep the Outer Banks open to kiting. It's one of the best destinations in the world. Period. You've got a true gem there. Let people enjoy it.

**Correspondence ID:** 937 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir, Madam -  
I am a kitesurfer.  
I am (was) planning to visit North Carolina (Hatteras) to kitesurf later this year. I now understand there is a proposal to restrict kitesurfing/beach access in the area.  
May I urge you to take a minimalist approach in this regard. Kitesurfing is a relatively environmentally friendly sport involving the consumption of no hydrocarbons during the activity (obviously one usually needs to drive to and from locations).  
The concern about disturbance to birds by kites is in my view way overdone. As a practitioner of the sport for many years I have seen a huge variety of species co-existing with kites with apparently no ill effect whatsoever. Is there any evidence at all of long-lasting adverse effects on bird life from kites? Lastly, I would point out that the US (like the UK) has an obesity and inactivity crisis. Environmental protection should be balanced against the positive benefits of encouraging participation in sports and making the facilities (including beaches) available to do so.  
I do hope you will keep Hatteras' beaches open and available for use and I look forward to being able to visit them.  
Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.  
Yours faithfully,  
James Barabas London, England

**Correspondence ID:** 938 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 05:22:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
As a long time visitor and property owner on the Outer Banks, I take the preservation of this beautiful and fragile ecosystem very seriously. We need to do a better job protecting this area for wildlife.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 939 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 05:47:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DO NOT WORRY..The beach will open back up for vehical travel.They will install a gate and pay to go system...This is to get you to appreciate the paid access.If it dont go back to the way it was,we are not going back.

**Correspondence ID:** 940 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 05:54:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The goal of most environmentally conscientious folks is to preserve the coastal environment for our wildlife AND for humans to enjoy as well. These are compatible goals. In my opinion, the National Park Service's preferred plan does not do this but rather it merely reflects the pressure of the lawsuit brought by the environmental groups (Southern Defenders of Wildlife, Audubon Society, etc.) These groups receive monies as a result of their "sky is falling" press releases often with questionable statistics. Where is the unbiased objective science behind their claims? As a retired Government Operations Research Analyst, I am appalled at the lack of scientific rigor behind the DEIS also. The economic impact "calculations", for example are not centered on the areas that are the hardest hit by these beach closures; rather the numbers are diluted by the inclusion of larger areas that are farther removed from the closures and therefore have received less impact. On the other hand, the calculations for the numbers of nesting birds, etc. is based solely on the closure areas and do not take into account the numbers of nests on Pea Island and the spoil islands. I consider myself an environmentally conscientious citizen and I know that residents on these banks are likewise. We walk the beach, picking up trash, calling for help when injured birds and whales and dolphins are found, and explaining to some the importance of local beach laws. So it is hard to accept the NPS preferred option under this flawed analysis and also because it will cause a much greater economic impact than outlined and it penalizes those who care for and preserve this fragile environment day to day. Would not education programs, law enforcement, and other more proactive and positive measures be more likely to succeed and keep our beaches open for all to enjoy? The lessons learned on our beaches could carry over to other environmentally fragile areas and be a win-win for all. Closing the beaches sends the message that humans cannot be trusted to do the right thing. The NPS preferred option is the old "stick" option

when our coast needs the "carrot" option. Seek out and punish those who do damage to our wildlife and beaches and encourage others to preserve, protect and ENJOY our beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 941    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Marchand, Michael D  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 06:02:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sir/Ma'am,  
 Good morning. I just recently heard about the proposed plans for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. While I applaud your attempts to protect the seashore, and the different species that live there, these plans seem almost too restrictive.  
 I am a kitesurfer. Generally I ride in the Dewey Beach areas in Delaware. Kitesurfing is an environmentally low impact sport. The only hydrocarbons consumed are those from our vehicles when we drive from DC to get to our destination. To minimize this, me and several of my friends carpool. I realize there is some concern for our "large kites" flying over and scaring birds. However, 90% of the time we are far from shore, and never anywhere near the birds in question.  
 At least a couple times a year, I make the drive down to Cape Hatteras for some vacation time from DC, and to do some kitesurfing in one of the United States foremost kitesurfing locations. This is bringing hard earned cash to the area. The plans that have been proposed will stop our people from coming down.  
 Please consider going with the least restrictive of the plans. I understand the desire to save the wildlife, but at the same time, we would like to continue to enjoy these areas for recreational use.  
 Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.  
 Sincerely, Michael D Marchand

---

**Correspondence ID:** 942    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 06:22:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 Wildlife must be protected & preserved for our world's environment.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 943    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 06:36:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern: Preserving and protecting the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is a concern for all whether it be year round residents or vacationing visitors. While the need for rules and regulations regarding access to Cape Hatteras are needed, the scope of these rules need to be kept in perspective in regard to what is best for the community and environment. A set of balanced regulations that would still allow access to all areas of the park and protect the environment would be ideal. Please keep access to the park open for all to enjoy one of the most treasured and beautiful areas in the world. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 944    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 06:52:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 945    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 06:52:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 07:48:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 29 April 2010 Sir,  
I would like to commend the NPS for putting together an ORV plan for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I believe that this plan should take into account the primary objective for the establishment of a National Seashore. i.e. as stated in the establishing legislation "areas shall be, and is hereby, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." To that end, I would like to offer the following comments on the proposal:  
1. I believe that Alternatives C, D, E, and F are far too restrictive in most of the areas addressed. This is in regard to allowing recreational access on the part of the public. I object to those limiting restrictions for ORV use in those alternatives. 2. I believe that Alternatives A or B are more than acceptable and provide the best compromise options. 3. I believe that the speed limits proposed in option B are better. 4. I have no problem with SMAs. However, I believe that there is no need to close the entire beach. Since the sea birds nest in the dunes, the lower beach (just above the high water mark) should remain open to both ORV and pedestrian traffic. Just as it is for sea turtle nests. 5. I agree that ORV access should be restricted seasonally in the village areas because of higher pedestrian usage. 6. ORV traffic should be restricted in some areas for safety or wetlands reasons. Access should be restricted to established ramps. 7. Additional ramps and pedestrian accesses would be nice but are not necessary. I would recommend against additional vehicle ramps. 8. Educational material could help users appreciate the seashore more and explain the reasons for some of the restrictions. 9. There appears to be no restrictions in these alternatives regarding driving on/in the dunes. The dunes need to be protected above all else as they are the "Keepers of the Kingdom." Violators should be severely prosecuted. 10. Night driving restrictions are apparently instituted to protect the nesting Sea Turtles. With a permit requirement that had an education part (NO FEE), this restriction should not be necessary. In any case, access should be granted 1 hour prior to sunrise, at a minimum. 11. I believe that establishing a proper carrying capacity is time consuming, expensive, and counterproductive. It will take much needed resources to establish, monitor and enforce! It will have a very large negative Public Relations impact (anti NPS) on anyone so restricted! 12. I believe that there should be NO Fees, for Anything!! 13. I believe that if there are too many restrictions placed on ORV and pedestrian access/usage, it will be highly unpopular and will encourage people to park beside the road and hike across the dunes to the water. This will defeat the purpose of this plan, ultimately be detrimental to all wildlife and help to destroy the dunes! 14. As with Pea Island Notional Wildlife Refuge, I believe that there should be provisions put in place for "dune replenishment." This may not be needed every season but is certainly needed! I would suggest that it include some type of "sprigging" newly refurbished areas with Sea Oats.  
The Audubon Society and other lobbying groups don't pay taxes to support the NPS. I DO!! My vote should count a lot more than theirs! I would like to reemphasize that a National Seashore is for the people first. It is NOT a National Wildlife Refuge. From your draft Plan: Visitation to the seashore is basically increasing. This IS the economic mainstay for Hatteras Island and Ocracoke. The piping plover population is increasing. The number of sea turtle nests is increasing. Alternative A/B is working! There is very little difference in the impacts of any of the alternatives either short or long term.  
When something isn't broken, Don't fix it!"  
Thank you,  
E. Glenn White 110 Lake Herrin Ct. Yorktown, Va. 23693

---

**Correspondence ID:** 947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 08:23:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir / Madam,  
I have recently moved to the DC area from New York. I moved here because of employment opportunities, but another great reason was that I will be closer to the best kitesurfing/kiteboarding area in the East Coast.  
I have been kiting for about 4 years now and I am looking forward to visiting North Carolina and enjoy the open terrain it has to offer. Please do not deny access to kiteboarders/kitesurfers for we, as a community, enjoy the water and environment around us.  
Bi-annually, we, the kiting community, visit the beaches we use and clean up any trash or unkempt areas. This helps out in the long run not jsut for us but for the whole beach area. If we set the example of cleaning up after yourself, people follow.  
Please do not terminate the use of the beaches for kilters. We beg of you to think a little more on the topic and even come down and see how people treat the area.

0009003

Thank you for your time and I hope I will be able to visit and ride in North Carolina very soon,  
Brendan P. Childs Project Manager Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

---

**Correspondence ID:** 948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 09:22:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Let the birds make adjustments as needed. They will find alternative locations or will not survive. Either is acceptable. Heck, beach homeowners are expected to find alternative locations or make necessary adjustments or they too will not survive. It is time to come to grips with reality.  
We all enjoy the birds but .....  
People are important and quality of life is important and if there are not piping plovers that my life's experiences will not be damaged significantly.  
People have rights and in my opinion, people should have greater rights to enjoy. Yes, we should use good judgement and make wise decisions but at the end of the day, piping plovers, etc. may not really be needed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 949    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 09:31:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir / Madam -  
I have been a visitor to Cape Hatteras once or twice a year for the last 25 years or so. It is a wonderful place that is relatively far from the crowds of the East Coast, and I have enjoyed windsurfing and kiteboarding there immensely.  
While I understand that wildlife needs to be adequately protected, I ask that you give reasonable consideration for the kites and boardsailors who currently use both the ocean and sound-side for their recreational activity. We are a group that is largely non-destructive to the wildlife, indeed the clean water and wildlife are some of the main reasons that we go to Hatteras.  
During the Spring and Fall months the wind and waves of Hatteras are some of the best in the world for kitesailing. Please limit your restrictions to beach access to the minimum so that we can continue to enjoy this special place.  
Thanks,  
Paul Kelley Annapolis, MD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 950    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 09:35:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The struggle to preserve our planet and its inhabitants is a dynamic and complex ever changing process. As humans we act on our ability to think dynamically and complex in conceptualizing different ideas into a reality. These ideas, though with good intention, sometimes do not represent the best possible idea. If we really take all perspectives into account we can come up with a better balanced plan to protect both our beaches and its inhabitants from undue harm, but also protect the ability for us who rely on this area for income, food, shelter and fun to continue having access to Cape Hatteras's one of a kind seashore.  
Recently it has come to my attention that the National Park Service is proposing some ideas to protect and preserve Cape Hatteras. In this plan is a variety of different options that are outlined as two no-action alternatives (A and B) and four action alternatives (C,D,E and F). I applaud the N.P.S. for its recognizing the importance of making sure Cape Hatteras is secure for the next 10 to 15 years. I respect nature, and I love Cape Hatteras. I am concerned though about the restriction of beach access proposed throughout this bill. So I hope that what ever plan is brought to reality, that it also considers the people who depend on this place for the reasons stated above. For what is the purpose of preserving and protecting something if it cannot be enjoyed at the same time?  
Cape Hatteras is a one of a kind destination not only for the United States, but many of our friends from afar. I am writing on behalf of a community that relies on Cape Hatteras beach access remaining open year round. This community is comprised of people who respect our planet and who's joy comes from a sport that is one of the most green friendly activities one could possibly participate in. It is called kiteboarding/kitesurfing. I being part of this community fully understand both the need to protect but also the need to respectfully use Cape Hatteras for fun. Make no mistake, fun is not the only reason I am writing this today. Residents of Cape Hatteras area fully depend on the income kiteboarders bring to Cape Hatteras. With this income they support the states tax structure and economy, not to mention their own livelihood.  
Obviously, I can't speak for everyone that will be affected by beach access being closed but I hope that the N.P.S. reads this and realizes maybe their cure is worse than the disease. So I argue for the position of creating a better balanced plan that preserves not only Cape Hatteras and its inhabitants, but also and just as much so, its human inhabitants ability access it. I argue that the kite's we fly have no long term affect on the environment or its inhabitants. Any disturbance to the local fish and birds is almost immediately undone once the animal realizes that we are no threat. This is no different to a natural disturbance by another native animal. If Cape Hatteras is more or less "closed down" to the public, another imbalance would be created perhaps worse than the one the N.P.S. believes exists today.  
Please understand that I am an advocate of preservation and conservation. I respect nature and the gift Cape Hatteras is, not only for pleasure but for its beauty and uniqueness. But I do not support a plan that would close beach access to the public and prevent the ability for we who rely on Cape Hatteras remaining open year round. I hope that the N.P.S. and Cape Hatteras National Seashore fully understand the harm that will come from any extremist type action. A balance must be held, I hope that you factor this large voice to keep the beach access open when weighing your options.  
Best of luck in your decision, Shawn Keating

---

**Correspondence ID:** 951    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Young, David A  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 09:51:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My father and I love to surf fish. He is 76 y/o. As you know, there is a lot of equipment you need to do this. I am asking that you leave the beach access open, so we both can enjoy many more trips together.  
I can say we've never run over any birds, turtles, or sea life. We always pick up any trash we see and bring it out.  
Closing ORV access to the beaches will stop many fishermen, like my dad from enjoying what they love to do.  
Do the right thing and please don't shut down our beaches to ORV's.  
Thank you David Young (son) Ollie Young (father)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 952    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 10:09:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Sirs and Madams,  
 I am writing to you concerning the proposed beach access regulations for the OBX, Hatteras seashore. I understand and appreciate the efforts that are being made to save this fragile environment and habitat for endangered species. Nothing is more important than preserving life and nature on our planet and everything is connected in some way. Human beings can often be selfish in this respect, and I will agree there needs to be some control of the situation. I also believe there should be some balance to these issues where reasonable human activities can coexist with nature. I have made over 20 trips to the OBX to enjoy the beaches, the sound - windsurfing and kitesurfing, and enjoying the unique natural surroundings. It would be very sad if we can not continue to enjoy this wonderful place, and for it to become off limits to future generations. While I urge you to consider the plan that allows for access for recreation I also support your efforts to improve and preserve nature. People may need to adapt to some strict rules to make this work, and some activities may need to be curtailed. However I feel that some activities are very benign and should not be banned altogether with some of the more obvious and damaging activities. We humans are also part of the ecosystem and we also deserve to commune with our natural environment. It may not be possible to make everyone happy with new rules, but please consider an approach that will be effective in your efforts but also gain the support of so many people who live or visit there. We all need to work together on this problem. In ending, I support the concepts of Plan C, which could probably also be further improved.  
 Sincerely  
 Roberto Villate

---

**Correspondence ID:** 953    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kelley, Paul  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 10:23:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir / Madam -  
 One additional comment on you proposed restrictions: there is a growing body of evidence that anthropogenic disturbances to small birds have little impact in term of energetic costs.  
 Please read <http://www.isabellebisson.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/06/PDF4.pdf> as an example.  
 Thanks again,  
 Paul Kelley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 954    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 10:29:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a long time visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I am firmly opposed to permanent beach closures in any manner. I feel that some of the proposed alternatives are rather draconian and go overboard, and while it is important to presevere seashore wildlife, the longterm economic impact of beach closures would be devastating to the local economy and not provide for the public good. I have spent many a vacation dollar in this area and would cease to do so if unable to access the beaches. In conclusion, please don't limit access to public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 955    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lamm, Kimberly L  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 10:59:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a Virginia resident but frequent Hatteras all the time. Though I am only 45 minutes from Virginia Beach, Va and could save gas and time by using this beach. I chose to drive the 2 hours to Hatteras for the only beach experience that I can enjoy and that is driving on the beach in my SUV. I have had the pleasure of this for the last 20 years. My family and I enjoy going to the beach in Hatteras with friends for surfing, fishing, and swimming; we also vacation there annual in the rental cottages. I do not feel that it is necessary to close the beaches or limit access to people or vehicles for the preservation of these birds. I live close to a water way and have the same birds that nest in my yard every year. I do not have to quarantine of my yard just to protect them and yet they return every year. Charles Darwin made an amazing discovery that you might have heard of, it's called evolution. The birds will and can survive in a co-existing environment with us. As with any species it learns to adapt to a changing environment for survival. If the beaches are closed or limited than you will create bigger problems. Let's save the birds, but is that worth the expense of ruining the surrounding towns on Hatteras. If the beaches are closed or restricted to no off road vehicles than I'm sure places like Waves, Salvo, etc. will loose the much dependent on tourist business. I can honestly say for myself and the majority of my friends and family that if we cannot drive on the beach than we will not go to Hatteras, NC. I will be forced to find some other place to spend my money and vacation with my family and friends. I do not support the plan for parking lots as I can only see this making things worse by forcing people to walk over dunes to get to the beach. To me this would hurt the environment worse. Not to mention the construction and up keep of these areas. I know in this time of economic hardship, that I do not appreciate my tax dollars being spent in such a manner. Since this is Federal property my hard earned Virginia dollars will support whatever decision is made. If I have to chose a plan, then I would have to support Alternative C, which allows for minimal closure and continues to allow over road vehicles on the beach. There is just no other type of experience like being able to drive on the beach with your family and spending a day at the beach. My children have grown up with no other beach experience other than Hatteras. I hope you make the right decision for the people and towns that survive on the beach activities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 956    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 11:00:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area. I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 957    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 11:10:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree w/the Park Service: We love Hatteras Island & its wildlife. We would do nothing to harm the critters. Leave the beaches open.

**Correspondence ID:** 958 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** keiser, peter  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 11:44:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support the surf riders associations view of the ballanced approach atnerative C as it applies to the use of recreational vehichles at the cape hatteras national seashore

**Correspondence ID:** 959 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 11:53:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not close the beaches in North Carolina. My husband and I have visited the beaches of North Carolina throughout our life together and they are an important part of both of my daughters' lives - we took them to the beaches there at starting at the age of 5 weeks (they are now 18 and 20). My daughters grew up not only seeing the beauty of the beaches but also we made it out responsibility to teach them to protect and respect the beach - with enjoyment comes responsibility. Every visit ended with a walk along the beach - picking up trash washed ashore. We joined the NC Beach Buggy Association and the Surf Rider Foundation as a family - all because of the mission to protect our beaches to ensure years of enjoyment. Our youngest daughter even received the Newport News Mayor's Outstanding Youth Award partly because she was telling classmates about her involvement with the organizations, her desire to respect the beaches and our family ritual of cleaning the beach. She is now entering Virginia Tech as a Natural Resource Conservation student - mainly because of her love of the beach and desire to continue her visits. PLEASE keep the beaches open for our future generations to enjoy and learn to respect. I cannot imagine what would happen to the economy on Hatteras Island if you allow the beaches to close - families have been living and visiting there for generations,no one would be there to experience the beauty and the history .... what a shame that would be.

**Correspondence ID:** 960 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 12:01:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel we have the duty to keep cars and trucks off the beach. (including park service personnel) We need to provide opportunities for the habitat to come back so that we do not lose any more ground in saving the animals that use this space to breed.

**Correspondence ID:** 961 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Pratscher, Robert L  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 12:24:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a simple home owner, not a lawyer, but I do have an educated opinion. What the government is trying to do on Hatteras Island is just plan wrong. After some research I have come to the conclusion that the beach closures that are being considered make no sense. There is no way it can possibly help any birds in any way. I also have a home in NJ and we have over 100 piping clovers nesting along our shores and they are doing very well without the large areas of restriction that is being asked for on Hatteras Island. No one that drives and or fishes the beach is of any threat to nesting birds. We may actually be of help by keeping some of the natural predators away by our presence. Also, the economic impact to the area could be pretty bad. The economy is bad enough. Everyone wants to protect these birds but what they are proposing will do little or no good. This is not the best area for them to nest to start with. I could go on and on but I am sure you have heard it all. I just wanted to go on record as being totally opposed to this nonsense. I cannot believe what they are asking for. Please stop this insanity and lets come up with a plan that makes sense. The people behind this are going way to far. I do not know exactly where they are getting there money from but I am willing to bet that many who have donated to them would not agree with how they are spending it in this case. By the way I am 65 and am trying to finally take some time off of work to fish and enjoy these beautiful beach's and now some idiots are trying to close them. This is just another case of another group of people going way to far with what they think is right. Someone has to stop them. If I owned a business on the island or even worse if I was one of the people who had donated there land with promises from the government of free and open access I would really be upset with all this. Just one more government lie. I sure home common sense and decency prevail.  
Robert L. Pratscher

**Correspondence ID:** 962 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Haines, Elaine  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 12:48:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was first brought to the Outer Banks as a child in 1955. I have been privileged to vacation here almost every year. My parents bought a building lot in Salvo on Hatteras Island in 1976. Since they are both deceased, my husband and I have inherited the property and are building a house there to live year round. It saddens me to think that now I am able to live a life long dream of being a resident of Hatteras Island, we and our family may not be able to enjoy this beautiful beach as we had planned. It doesn't seem right that the Park Service can change the rules of open beaches, as was promised when this area was first designated as a National Seashore, to so many restrictions that the economy of the area has been greatly affected. My greatest concern is that vacationers will stop coming to Hatteras Island because of the beach closures, and the value of our property will be very much diminished. We had hoped our property would increase in value and be an investment we could pass on to our children, but this is definitely in jeopardy. Will the Park Service be able to reimburse all the land owners of Hatteras Island for their property devaluation?  
I realize we are responsible to protect the wildlife here on the island, but I'm sure that can be accomplished without such extreme measures that are affecting the local businesses. I ask you to please choose Alternative A for your immediate Plan/EIS. Thank you for your time.  
Sincerely, Elaine Haines

**Correspondence ID:** 963 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:  
It has been brought to the attention of the EastKB (East Kiteboarding www.eastkb.com) community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks, North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wild life observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected thus understand certain steps maybe needed to achieve this goal. Thank you for evaluating the options to improve the environmental conditions at one of the greatest destinations in the United States of America.  
However, with the aforementioned said, please consider the responses you choose carefully. Minimalist environmental management approaches have worked well throughout the United States' National Parks. Closing extensive sections of beaches, the sound, and water ways will strip the very nature

and reason for why we appreciate the land in its current state. It can be said, with great certainty, that all frequent and casual users of this place intend to preserve its natural beauty and respect its great wilderness.

The proposed plans affect many groups of people ? we urge that you keep in mind the desires of all parties involved, as a significant change in the way the Outer Banks environmental situation is handled may result in a significant decrease in utilization of the land.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Please read our "Field Report" section of our Forums page to gauge how many people travel to the Outer Banks annually; these people help support the environment, local business and the local economy.

Kiteboarding is an environmentally friendly (quiet, no pollution and very little, if any, waste) activity which we are proud to partake in. We respect the environment and look forward to participating with those individuals charged with changing the way the current environmental issues are handled. We look forward to your consideration and hope to continue our frequent and ecologically friendly use of this wonderful destination.

Kind Regards, Jane Peterson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:22:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 965    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:22:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 966    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:22:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 967    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:22:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 968    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:22:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 969    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, most of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 970    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:22:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 971    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:22:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 972    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 973    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 974    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 975    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 976    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 977    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 978    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 979    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 980    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 981    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 982    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Put Natural Resources First.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.  
\* Provide Equal Access for All Visitors.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. As a graduate of UNC-Chapel Hill and someone who hopes to return to NC someday, I really care about what happens along the shore there. It's where I first learned to love birding.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 985    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 986    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 987    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Regardless of the dangers to the wildlife, I would appreciate a quiet place to enjoy the seashore without ORV users running wild!

Thanks,  
diane

- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 988    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 989    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 990    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 991    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 992    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 993    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 994    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 995    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 997    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 998    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 999    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:23:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1000	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29,2010 13:23:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</li> <li>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</li> <li>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1001    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1002    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1003    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1004    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1005    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1006    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1007    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are very important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its regular numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1008    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1009    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:23:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1010    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Holden, Dean E  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

It has been brought to the attention of the EastKB (East Kiteboarding www.eastkb.com) community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks, North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wild life observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected thus understand certain steps maybe needed to achieve this goal. Thank you for evaluating the options to improve the environmental conditions at one of the greatest destinations in the United States of America.

However, with the aforementioned said, please consider the responses you choose carefully. Minimalist environmental management approaches have worked well throughout the United States' National Parks. Closing extensive sections of beaches, the sound, and water ways will strip the very nature and reason for why we appreciate the land in its current state. It can be said, with great certainty, that all frequent and casual users of this place intend to preserve its natural beauty and respect its great wilderness.

The proposed plans affect many groups of people ? we urge that you keep in mind the desires of all parties involved, as a significant change in the way the Outer Banks environmental situation is handled may result in a significant decrease in utilization of the land.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Please read our "Field Report" section of our Forums page to gauge how many people travel to the Outer Banks annually; these people help support the environment, local business and the local economy.

Kiteboarding is an environmentally friendly (quiet, no pollution and very little, if any, waste) activity which we are proud to partake in. We relish our time in the natural environment and look forward to participating with those individuals charged with changing the way the current environmental issues are handled. We look forward to your consideration and hope to continue our frequent and ecologically friendly use of this wonderful destination.

Kind Regards,  
Dean Holden 10 Rodney Road Dover, DE 19901

**Correspondence ID:** 1011    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Miller, Robert E  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:47:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I Support the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement

**Correspondence ID:** 1012    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rauch, David L  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:49:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I Support the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement

**Correspondence ID:** 1013    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the DEIS plan for pet management. The no pet rule during high season will further the negative impacts of the beach closure. Why can't a person using the campground bring their dog?  
I am opposed to the way the NPS does predator control. The wanton killing of hundreds of indigenous mammals each year for the benefit of other wildlife is wrong. Has the NPS addressed the effects of the removal of the mammals on the rest of the ecosystem?  
I am opposed to the massive buffers created by the NPS. There is not another park that allows for a 2000m closure for the plover.

**Correspondence ID:** 1014    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1015    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1016    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1017    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1018    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

As an enthusiastic naturalist and birder, I am concerned about the continued protection of birds and their nesting sites. As we all care about our environment and wildlife, I believe this is an important issue.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1019    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1020    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Alternative D would offer the majority of beach users more opportunities for enjoying the beach and would result in fewer disturbances to wildlife, nesting birds in particular. I feel strongly that we should share our beaches with the wildlife that depend on them, and that there are certain activities that are not compatible with such sharing.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1021    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1022    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1023    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1024    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1025    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1026    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. Our wildlife needs all the protection it can get, both through public policy and legal channels.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Wildlife needs our protection, since it is humans who are causing destruction of their habitat. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1027    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1028    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1029    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1030    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1031    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 Protect the birds and turtles! This place was not created for vehicle use!  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1032    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1033    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Beach driving on Hatteras Island has been a tradition since before the creation of the National Seashore. My family and I visit Hatteras & Ocracoke Islands at least 3-4 times a year, and have been doing annual trips since the late 1980's. Driving on the beach to surf fish, surf and now kitesurf has been something that fully reinforces the edge of the world feel. Nowhere else in the country can you ride for miles looking for the perfect rip for casting your bait, the perfect peak for paddling out and surfing for hours, the perfect tidal pool for the kids to play in. Closure of the beaches to off road vehicles in order to protect migratory birds is silly. The birds typically nest in the dune line, above the high tide lines. Most vehicle traffic along the beach is along or below the high tide line. Riding in the soft sand along the dunes is a good way to get stuck. Common sense indicates that the birds can nest and not be disturbed by vehicles. If the birds nest below the high tide line, Maybe Darwin had a point. Keep the vehicles away from the dunes, keep the dogs on leashes, heavily fine vehicles in the dune line, mostly apply common sense. In praise of common sense and rational rules. Pete Chileas

**Correspondence ID:** 1034    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1035    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1036    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1037    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1038    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1039    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1040    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1041    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Only Alternative D gives enough protection to the endangered wildlife along this marvelous coast as well as protection to pedestrian traffic. I have plenty of bad experience with ORV traffic running myself and friends off of trails on beaches and in the woods in upper peninsula Michigan as well as witnessing the damage to fragile environments that they leave behind. I have also witnessed them purposely harassing wildlife in Alaska. Please restrict them as much as you legally can and police them carefully where they are allowed. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1042    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1043    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1044    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1045    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1046    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1047    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1048    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1049    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1050    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 As a resident of Massachusetts, I feel the threat towards our beaches very closely. The industrial and urban sprawl is getting to be out of control, and this plan would help protect the wildlife and natural state of beaches like the ones that I love. I hope that you support this plan.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1051    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1052    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife. As a birder, I value opportunities to get out in our national parks and experience the beauty and serenity of the natural world. For me, this is possible only where motorized are excluded.  
 The following principles should guide the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1053    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
 My husband and I stayed on the Outer Banks many times. We feel that birds and turtles need their own space and they don't need vehicles on "their" space. Please support Alternative D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1054    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1055    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1056    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1057    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Many years ago (in the 1960's) I was fortunate enough to spend a whole month camping on Cape Hatteras. I was only 12 yrs old but it made an indelible impression on me. The area has no doubt changed greatly and I doubt for the better.

ORV use degrades pretty much any environment where it's allowed. I've seen it in person in the Dunes NRA in Oregon where I live. I've also taken care of many of the injured users in the operating room where I used to work. It's a mindless and resource intensive, polluting activity.

Please act for the greater good and do everything in your power to protect the land and all that depends upon it in your management area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1058    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1059    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1060    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1061    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1062    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1063    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1064    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1065    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1066    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
ORV's have no place in an area deemed to be "natural." Granting ORV access in effect is a giveaway to those few on ORVs, as their presence makes the area unusable by anyone else.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a final plan that takes into account the greater good and so better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1067    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1068    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1069    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1070    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1071    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I support a balanced approach to free and open beaches with reasonable wildlife management. I disagree with a number of the measures proposed in Alternative F which is the preferred option of the NPS. The piping plover unfledged chick buffer of 1,000 meters is totally unreasonable, both in scope and size. I agree with the American Oystercatcher management conceptually, but again disagree with the set required closure space of 300 meters. These measures are not realistic in achieving beach use for visitors. The proposal results in total wildlife use only.

The culture around ORV use on Hatteras, particularly the southern beaches, is ingrained as a tradition for HI. Not being able to use the beaches with ORV, at night, without undue restrictions is like saying you can no longer clam at Cape Cod. It is outrageous for those who understand and know its tradition. NPS has neglected its duty to seriously consider the impact of these proposals on the culture of the island and the resulting severe negative impact on the local economy and way of life.

Prohibiting vehicles year round from two of the best fishing spots, Hatteras and Ocracoke inlet beaches is again, outrageous. No islander could conceive that as a reasonable approach. What they have to give up is not balanced with the protection of wildlife.

Overall, night driving to access surf fishing is a staple of the local economy. It just cannot be a reasonable solution to protecting wildlife. We have observed beach closures for the past 2 years and have been impacted negatively in our desire to use the beach in its traditional form. We are protective of the areas marked off by the NPS for bird and turtle enclosures and would report and prevent any damage to them. The islanders have lived with wildlife from the beginning of time --- the point is they have lived with wildlife - not given up their way of life for them and it is not balanced to place these draconian measures on the island.

This area, specifically the southern beaches below Nags Head, are unlike any other in the world, and people come there for that very reason. The Alternative F proposals would ruin the visitor experience enjoyed for 150 years and badly hurt the local economy. You cannot look at the southern beaches and northern beaches together for considering economic impact and beach use. They are much too different to lump together. Some conclusions based on visitor experience based on northern beach tourism just do not apply south of Nags Head.

Management of wildlife resources will require resources (money, programs, people). Is that the reason such draconian measures are proposed? In other words, has the proposal been developed with the idea of saving money rather than giving tax-paying citizens their due access? Who can be against protections for wildlife? Most people want to see protection and are willing to give in some areas to achieve both ends --- beach access and better habitat. It can't be implemented at the expense of a unique lifestyle on the Outer Banks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1072    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1073    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:53:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1074    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1075    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I am a firm believer that "beaches are meant for walking, not driving." Alternative D would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
Yet I realize that the National Park Service must make accommodations for others who do not completely--if at all--share this attitude. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1076    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1077    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1078    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1079    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1080	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 13:53:55						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1081	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 13:53:55						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1082	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 13:53:55						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1083    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 13:53:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1084    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 13:53:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

The alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

Thank you for listening to my opinion.

**Correspondence ID:** 1085    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 13:54:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1086    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1087    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1088    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1089    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. As a person living in the Rocky Mountain west I have personally witnessed the destruction unregulated ORV use can have on wildlife and the environment. This ORV use should be stopped altogether or significantly curbed.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1090    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1091    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1092    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1093    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1094    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1095    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1096    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1097    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1098    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1099    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1100    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1101    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1102    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1103    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1104    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1105    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1106    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1107    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
As a former National Park Ranger, I feel the best way to serve the NPS mission of providing for the enjoyment of the park "in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" is to preserve the true nature of the park by limiting ORV use. Losing the birds and sea turtles for which Cape Hatteras is famous would be a tragedy, and would certainly lessen the unique value of the park.  
Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide these comments. I hope that you will choose a balanced final plan for Cape Hatteras that best protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1108    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1109    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I am a native and resident of NC and have visited Cape Hatteras every year for the past 30 years. The natural beauty and wildlife are awe-inspiring. To think that birds and turtles are to suffer because of something as mindless as ORV is disgusting.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1110    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1111    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1112    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1113    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1114    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1115    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1116    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1117    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1118    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1119    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1120    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1121    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1122    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1123    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 We have threats to wildlife increasing everywhere, and it makes perfect sense to decrease the threats in the places that we can - like Cape Hatteras.  
 Thank you for considering my perspective.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1124    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1125    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1126    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1127    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1128    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1129    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1130    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1131    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

0009061

**Correspondence ID:** 1132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:55:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:55:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.  
We have become a nation of fat people. Riders of ORV's should not be allowed on the Seashore unless they weigh at least 75 pounds less than the vehicles on which they are riding. ORV parking areas should be provided next to the scales on which their riders are weighed, and if the riders are too large they must park their ORV's and be allowed access only as Seashore pedestrians.  
Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1135    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1136    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1137    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1138    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1139    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1140    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1141    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:55:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1142    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:55:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1143    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:55:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Please, help save this for us, the people of this country.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1144    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1145    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1146    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. I fully support this form letter! Please save the birds

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1147    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunities for non-ORV users of the beaches and result in less disruption of wildlife, which are my principal priorities.  
The following points should inform the park's creation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Above all else, protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. The plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you allowing me to provide these comments. I will be following developments at Cape Hatteras, and I will hope for a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1148    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV users of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide greater opportunity for non-ORV users of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife.  
I believe that the following principles should be the basis for the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Provide equal access for all visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan (Alternative F), ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of seashore beach. This gives a disproportionate amount of the beach to ORV use. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. This approach, combined with more walkways and better access facilities, would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could more safely enjoy the seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put natural resources first. Protecting the natural resources and wildlife of the seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The National Park Service's preferred plan fails to set aside adequate year-round non-ORV areas for wildlife, including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. The wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimum buffers and should be increased to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and meet clear goals for wildlife recovery. A seashore management plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Although there are management targets in the DEIS, they need to be based on the potential of the seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. In areas where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals as well as adequate management to achieve them should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1150    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

These creatures are increasingly facing huge threats. They already live on the fringes of society. We need to protect what little habitat they have to survive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1153    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1154    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1155    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1156    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1157    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1159    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. ORVs should really be banned! The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. ORVs should really be banned! \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. ORVs should really be banned! \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. ORVs should really be banned! Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1160    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:55:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1161    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 13:55:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1162    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1163    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. There is nothing natural about using motorized vehicles in natural areas and clearly defeats the purpose of protecting natural resources.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1164    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1165    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1166    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

0009073

**Correspondence ID:** 1168    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:55:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1169    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Vehicles are already EVERYWHERE! We spend billions per year to maintain roads we already have...can't we simply LEAVE THESE AREAS ALONE? Is there NO WHERE for wildlife or people to escape the noise and destruction of any type of vehicle??!  
\* Put Natural Resources First. This should be all that needs to be said! Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1170    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:56:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1171    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:56:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1172    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Tipton, Bill

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 13:57:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm sending this to you in regards to Cape Hatteras. My family as been going here for the last 40 years and I would hate to see the next generation loose this special place. The people of the island depend on tourist visiting every year and with the current state of closers people have quit coming. I have a few thing to say that could help. Cape Point is what everyone comes to see and I know wildlife frequents this place to make nests, but with the harsh environment that summer storms and extreme high tides no nest survive. I would like to see the area around the salt ponds cleared for a bird habitat. When it was cleared before, birds used it and flourished. As for turtle nest, they should be moved to a safer location that already has closers and not many people frequent. If this happen, Cape Point would never have to close and this would help the local economy rebound. Dredge Islands are over run with birds of all kinds and should be counted. These islands should be encouraged to be built and should be maintained. Night time driving has done nothing but help and should be reinstated. With people on the beaches at night, predators do not have a chance to feed. I'll go a long with a beach driving permit. Carolina Beach does it and it has helped slow the traffic down. Please remember everything proposed is doing exactly what the Special Interest Groups are pushing for and taking our right from us. How many of the people wanting us off the beach have ever stepped foot on a beach at Hatteras at all? Now I'm sure by all the phone calls, letters, and emails you receive daily from those of us that frequent the island to fish, go shelling and for family vacations you will see why we are fighting this so hard. Many of us do not even live there and think of this special place as our home. This country was founded by people like us not Special Interest Groups.

**Correspondence ID:** 1173    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir, Madam -

I am a beach enthusiast and a kitesurfer.

I am planning to visit North Carolina (Hatteras) to kitesurf later this year, however I now understand there is a proposal to restrict kitesurfing/beach access in the area.

May I urge you to take a minimalist approach in this regard. Kitesurfing is a relatively environmentally friendly sport involving the consumption of no hydrocarbons during the activity (obviously one usually needs to drive to and from locations). We are constantly looking to protect and maintain the launch sites in order to enjoy this "green Sport."

The concern about disturbance to birds by kites is in my view is way overdone. I do not believe that the occasional kite being launched on the beach only to be flown on the water has a significant affect on the birds/nesting spots. I would urge you to consider the other dangers that exist such as other predators and beach erosion.

Lastly, I would point out that the US (like the UK) has an obesity and inactivity crisis. Environmental protection should be balanced against the positive benefits of encouraging participation in sports and making the facilities (including beaches) available to do so.

I do hope you will keep Hatteras' beaches open and available for use and I look forward to being able to visit them.

Sincerely,  
[Nicholas Vornle] Southerm, Connecticut

**Correspondence ID:** 1174    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:22:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Cape Hatteras is one of my favorite places and it is important to me to reduce disturbance of wildlife by ORV and increase peace and quiet in general. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1175    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:22:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1176    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:22:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1177    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:22:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1178    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:22:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1179    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:22:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1180    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

ORV's are unnatural, unsustainable, and have no place in our National Parks any more than they would in our National museums or any other of our nation's treasured places. We don't allow hunting, because it creates an unsafe atmosphere within the parks, putting both people and nature at risk.

ORV's are just as deadly, perhaps moreso, to wildlife than guns. They kill indiscriminately, maime the land, destroy the soil structure, and leave a tire-track waste land in their paths. I demand we have NATIONAL PARKS, not national parking lots!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1181    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:22:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1182    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1183    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1184    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1185    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1186    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1187    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1188    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
As a travel agent with a focus on ecotourism, I know the economic benefits of having wildlife for travelers to view. I know that birding brings in huge income to areas where birds are protected and beaches are a prime spot for them to nest and raise chicks. ORV's have many places to drive at high speeds. Beaches are not the right place Please do all you can to protect the beaches for wildlife  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1189    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1190    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:23:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1191    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:23:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1192    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:23:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1193    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:23:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1194    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:23:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1195    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:23:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1196    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Off Road Vehicles are an abomination. They should be outlawed for recreational use and restricted to use by farmers and those who manage herds. I have seen the peace and tranquility of much formerly wild land ruined by these mechanical monsters, and I fear that mankind is rapidly losing its sacred heritage, its 'connectedness' with nature.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1197    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:23:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1198    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:23:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1199    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1200    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

For many of us that have health or disability issues, the shore is not a friendly place. With the addition of ORVs it can be hazardous. Our intent in visiting is to enjoy the nature of the shoreline and area vice dealing with mass motored vehicles. There should be an area allowed for the pristine quality of nature itself.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

A very large fraction of our Atlantic coast has been totally devoted to mass recreation and development of resorts, with wildlife driven from their habitat. Alternative D is needed to preserve beaches in close to their natural state. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1204    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 ORV use on a beach can be dangerous. In Florida, several people on the beaches have been injured by ORVs and automobiles. ORV use on any beach anywhere should be the exception, not the rule. Beaches belong to the wildlife that use them and humans should tread lightly there.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1205    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1206    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1207    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:23:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1208    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
We need to preserve the wildlife (including plants) at Cape Hatteras and motor vehicles are NOT wildlife. I think they should be kept out completely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1209    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1210    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1211    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1212    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1213    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

It is wrong to allow a few people to destroy the peace and quiet, the safety of children, the habitat for seabirds and the biodiversity of native plants that are essential to the health of the seashore ecosystem.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1214    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1215    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me, someone who visits this area and enjoys the beauty particularly when ORV engine noise is absent.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
This is my country. I was born here and have lived in many parts of this country and vacationed in many others. An 84% decline in waterbirds is totally unacceptable. Since when is any idiot who is able to get their hands on an ORV able to defy our laws and damage our native plants and animals? Here in Minnesota we are altogether familiar with this problem. These witless wonders go out and destroy property and wildlife because we cannot watch all the area 24/7. Please help save our part of the planet for the future. Thank You.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1217    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:24:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1218    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:24:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1219    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1220    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1221    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I am a visitor of national parks specifically for the quiet I find there and for the opportunities to view wildlife that they provide.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1222    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1223    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1224    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1225    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for pedestrian and wildlife uses of the beaches and result in less destruction of the natural beauty of the area, which are important to me.  
The following principles should be kept in the park's final plan, even if it does not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This is not right. ORV use should not be allowed on the beaches at all; at a minimum half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. These need to be based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1226    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1227    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:24:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1230    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1231    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1232    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1233    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1234    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1235    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1236    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1237    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1238    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1239    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

0009097

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1240    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1241    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Of the proposed plans for the management of ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, we support the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D. The natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be protected, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection.  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1242    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1243    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1244    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1245    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I have spent time walking on some of these beaches and ORV use clearly needs to be more restricted, to preserve the quiet beauty and the wildlife of these park areas. Beaches are not roadways! This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1247    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1249    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I am writing at the urging of the Audubon Society, whose position I support fully. For years I have been asking myself why we, as a society, allow jet skis on rivers, motorboats on lakes, motorized vehicles on beaches, and snowmobiles in national Parks. At some point in the last century many Americans developed an addiction to motor sport, probably at the same time we became a throw away culture. Both are forms of environmental suicide and must be reined in.

The alternative plan the audubon Society recommends would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1250	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 14:26:24						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1251	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I have visited Cape Hatteras in the past to view wildlife, particularly birds, and widespread ORV use would be extremely detrimental to such pursuits. At a time when ecotourism is widespread and accounting for so many billions of dollars, and wildlife is under such siege, it is extremely important to preserve it and the impact of the nearby communities. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1252	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 14:26:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the						

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1253    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1254    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1255    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1256    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1257    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1258    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1259    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Vehicles have millions of miles of roadways to use without using natural areas. Vehicles are not for recreation; they are for ransporation. Keep them out of natural areas. ORVs do not deserve to use the majority of beach space, while non-ORV users get little protected beach. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1260    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:26:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:26:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:26:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Cape Hatteras does not need the added burden of off-road vehicles tearing up the beaches and endangering both plants and animals. Nita Laughlin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1266    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1267    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1268    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:26:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1269    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:27:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1270    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:27:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1271    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:27:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1272    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:27:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1273    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:27:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1274    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:27:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1275    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:27:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1276    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:27:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1277    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1278    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1279    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1280    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

The following principles should guide the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This is not a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed in the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. With more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity in the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be compatible with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife, including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums, and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1281    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which, as an ecotourist, are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1282    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1283    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. As a supporter of protecting coastal habitats, particularly those necessary to migratory and nesting shorebirds I would like to share some comments.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Humans have done many terrible things to this world, but we can also do good things. Remember, extinct means forever.

**Correspondence ID:** 1284    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1285    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:52:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1286    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1287    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1288    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1289    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1290    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1291    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1292    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1293    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1294    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1295    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1296    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1297    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The birds do not get the chance to speak for themselves. We need responsible action to prevent destruction of their breeding grounds. Preventing over use by ORV's has become a National issue almost everywhere we turn. Please protect these birds in this valuable location

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1298    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1299    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1300    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1301    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1302    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1303    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1304    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1305    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1306    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1310    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1311    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1312    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1313    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1318    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1319    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1320    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1321    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 14:53:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1323    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1324    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. The noise and pollution from these vehicles are very disturbing to me. It is disturbing to me when I want to go somewhere for peace and quiet and to enjoy the wildlife to have to listen to someone's motorcycle or ATV.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1325    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. Beaches should be quiet and safe for humans and wildlife alike; indeed they are home and nesting sites for birds and turtles and must be protected.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors - and all wildlife inhabitants - that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Please, please, please protect our rare and endangered species and habitats. It is our moral responsibility to do this.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:53:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:54:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1329    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:54:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1330    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:54:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1331    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:54:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1332    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:54:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1333    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:54:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1334    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:54:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1335    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:54:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1336    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 14:54:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1337    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 14:54:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1338    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Clark, Frank G  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 15:12:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Comment on the DEIS

I do not agree with option F on the "pets in the park issue". I feel that the current status that requires pets to be controlled on a 6 foot leash does not need to be further restricted. If you have bird and turtle areas fenced off, how can a dog on leash create any harm? In fact, I think that during the fall and winter that dogs should be allowed on the oceanfront off leash in the village boundaries.

One more point on pets. Service dogs are by ada definition not pets. the legal definition goes way beyond those dogs trained for the visually impaired, and includes animals that assist humans with a variety of physical impairments.

**Correspondence ID:** 1339    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stacey, Will  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear N.P.S., It has come to my attention that the Park Service is considering some new and restrictive regulations involving recreational access on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I grew up in that area in the late 1970's and can remember when there was hardly a soul around, my family still lives in Dare County (since 1968) and I visit twice a year with family for vacations. I have witnessed first hand some of the overcrowding and reckless behavior, especially regarding ORV's, and understand the increasing need to regulate all this new traffic on the seashore. However, I strongly urge you to protect and even enhance pedestrian access to the seashore during all times of the year, even while restricting ORV use at the same time. Let me be clear, my direct observation over 30 years of visiting the Seashore is that ORV's do 95% of all damage to natural resources in the area. I do not believe people should be kept out of their own federal lands at any time, but their ORV's should be banned or at least heavily restricted. I strongly believe that restricting human activity on the Seashore will also have adverse economic effects on the area, people come for the beaches. Economic studies have shown that very few visitors actually drive on the beaches anymore, restricting ORV's will not hurt the region economically, restricting pedestrians will hurt. Why would any family vacation there anymore if there is no access to the ocean or sound? More attention needs to be paid to other non-motorized activities that draw tourists - bird watching, kayaking, surfing, and especially kitesurfing. There has been a lot of local investment in these other activities in the past decade ( kitty hawk kites, Real Kites, many local surf shops,.....). Please, I urge you to not punish us all because of a very few reckless ORV drivers, keep the beaches open for people and wildlife, not ORV's! Thank you for your time, and good luck.

**Correspondence ID:** 1340    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 15:22:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1341    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:22:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Dear Superintendent Murray, National Parks are all about nature. Please establish a plan to preserve the habitat on Cape Hatteras National Seashore by managing ORV use. Such a plan should protect the species that use this park for nesting.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1342    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:22:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1343    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:22:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1344    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:22:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

This is a NATIONAL Seashore, after all. I routinely visit other states Wildlife Refuges and National Parks to enjoy the outdoors, not 4-wheelers running rampant. Please help.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1345    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:22:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1346    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1347    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1348    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1349    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 Wildlife has always been an important part of the "park experience" for me--ORVs are not! Though I've never been to Cape Hatteras, I have been to a number of national parks, and it has always been a great experience, largely because of the wildlife there. It's important to do what can be done to make the park safe for wildlife, and of course for human visitors.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1350    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1351    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1352    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1353    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1354    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1355    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1356    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1359    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1360    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Coming from the state of SC and seeing the sea turtles first hand in an environmentally safe surroundings I urge you to take the following measures.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1361    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me: I am a life-long beach-goer and sailer.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented immediately until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1362    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1363    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1365    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1366    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1367    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
Our national parks preserve more than just a quiet place to visit and "get away from it all." They preserve fragile habitats, endangered wildlife, and a heroic notion that we humans can just say "no" to abject destruction of EVERY habitat for the sake of entertainment. The heroic notion that we can value a spot just for what it is, as nature created it, set aside for the enjoyment of all. That enjoyment should stipulate that the site remains unaltered by and untrammelled by man. It would be an act of courage by the NPS to say "No" to snow mobiles in Yellowstone and "No" to ORVs in all our parks, and especially along the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
Today, the assault is by ORVs -- a mechanical atrocity whose riders have wreaked irreparable damage on every environment they touch. I have seen first-hand the damage to National Parks and Monuments in Utah, where off-roaders have barreled past the "No vehicles beyond this point" signs and destroyed the fragile biotic soils that took decades to emerge. In my lifetime, these areas will not recover to their original, pristine condition. Tomorrow, the assault will be from yet-unimagined forms of "entertainment."  
The time to say no is now. You can attempt to manage the use of ORVs, but this will guarantee the further loss of endangered animals and fragile habitat in those areas where ORVs are not banned.  
The ORV supporters push their "right" to access to these lands. The writers of the famous national park mission statement could not have imagined that "the enjoyment of all who come" would include dune buggies, motorcycles, snow mobiles and ORVs. Enjoyment should not be stretched so far as to include destruction. Who will support the "rights" of animals who are chased, harassed, run down and denied the chance to breed/exist?  
I am a native North Carolinian, born in Winston-Salem. I have been to the Outer Banks and the CHNS many times, and cherish the beauty, quiet and epic importance to endangered wildlife these parks provide. The documented losses to wildlife alone are alarming, and clearly linked to the disturbances caused by ORV users.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1368    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1369    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1370    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1371    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1372    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1373    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

I spend a lot of time on the Oregon Coast...and I know how devastating offroad vehicles can be to a pristine shoreline, I totally agree that ORVs be prohibited year round on the 16 miles designated of Seashore Beach. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1377    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1378    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Alternative D provides for less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me, but I feel it also lacks the importance of some of the public needs being met. Ideally, I feel that three items that were included in Alternative E should be included in Alternative D to optimize both minimal environmental impacts and recreational enjoyment: (1) the interdunal road and ramp access would be improved, and more pedestrian access would be provided through substantial additions to parking capacity at various key locations that lend themselves to walking on the beach, (2) self-contained vehicle (SCV) camping would be allowed during the off-season at designated Seashore campgrounds under the terms of a permit, and (3) enhanced options for pedestrian access to Bodie Island Spit and South Point Ocracoke by promoting water taxi service when those areas are closed to ORVs. Should the NPS choose not to implement Alternative D (with or without my submitted adjustments), I feel it needs to stay focused on some critical issues: (1) all visitors should be able to enjoy the park equally; (2) the goal of a national park is to be enjoyed for its beauty (whether that be sand, water, sounds of nature or aesthetics) and destruction of those items of beauty is not true to the NPS goal to preserve, protect and share the history of this land and its people; and (3) clear species recovery management and goals need to be set and monitored from the start, and if those goals are not being met, additional protective measures need to be implemented.

Thank you for allowing the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1379    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:23:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1380    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1381    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1382    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1383    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1395    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1396    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1397    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:23:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1398    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:24:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:24:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:24:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1401    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:24:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1402    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:24:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1403    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:24:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

If you were a rare species you would want someone to speak up for you - right???

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1404    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Pellissier, Meg  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:24:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the proposed pets rule because an advantage of vacationing at the Outer Banks are the plentiful "pet" houses and the ability to have your dog with you on the beach. In the almost 20 years that I've been vacationing in Avon, I have never witnessed dog owners allowing their pets to roam in the dunes.  
Regarding the bird nests, I disagree with the proposal to close off an area of 770+ acres per brood including the beach in front of the houses. What happens if a nest is built on the dune directly in front of your house or in your yard? Why can't the bird nests be cordoned off the same way that the turtle nests are?  
I disagree with the strict ORV access rules for a number of reasons. Fisherman need to carry their equipment on/off the beach. Many of the homes have elevators, which provide a benefit to disabled and elderly visitors; being able to ride onto the beach in a vehicle also gives these visitors easy access to the ocean. As for nighttime driving, as long as drivers are using the required access points and avoiding the dunes, why is this now a problem?  
Especially if the bird nests are cordoned off so that they are visible to the drivers.  
The proposals seem destined to kill off the local economy and home values.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Luchs, Richard W  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:30:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Ladies and Gentlemen- I am submitting my comments with respect to the proposed plan for the Hatteras Island beaches to express my concerns regarding what appears to me to be a well intentioned, an unbalanced and overreactive approach to the prospective use of our beaches. As the owner of a home fronting on the ocean in Kinnakeet Shores, North Carolina, for the last 22 years, I have had the opportunity to observe the use of the beaches during the busiest periods of the Summer season, as well as during the Spring and Fall. During that period the pedestrian traffic has increased somewhat simply by virtue of new homes being constructed, but certainly nowhere near the level of other beach front communities such as Ocean City, Maryland or Rehobeth Beach, Delaware. And because of the limited area in which to build new homes, it is unlikely that occupancy will increase significantly above existing levels. At the same time, vehicular traffic has actually decreased significantly over the same period and does not encroach on or impede recreational use by pedestrians. What I have observed is that the beach community continues to be largely a family destination where families can bring small children; pets; and large family groups and feel comfortable. The proposed plan, however, as I understand it could severely limit beach access to those families whose principal reason for coming to Hatteras Island is to spend time on the beach because it will prevent them from bringing their pets on vacation (as a dog owner myself, I know it can be very costly to board pets) and because apparently certain significant areas (more than necessary) of the beach may be closed because of the presence of piper plovers or American Oystercatchers. While I am keenly aware of environmental concerns and other issues facing park service properties (having briefly worked for the Park Service in Washington D.C. many years ago and visited National Parks throughout the country), I have not observed any restrictions in any other park areas as severe as what is currently proposed for the Hatteras Seashore. The Hatteras Seashore beaches have been, and continue to be, among the best beaches in the United States for years because their use has been respected by visitors who generally behave in a responsible manner, clean up after themselves, and, while visiting, have contributed to economic well-being of the island community at large. A balance should be struck that encourages the continued vitality of that community while also preserving the quality of the beaches and protecting the wildlife that inhabits them. The proposed plan will severely tip that balance in a manner which will diminish the use, and therefore the benefit to homeowners and vacationers alike, of the beaches. I urge you to consider less extreme measures which will recognize and respect that balance. Thankyou

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:52:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1407    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:52:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:52:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. I look forward to visiting this beautiful shoreline someday with the above mentioned improvements in place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:52:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:52:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Please do not let one small group of ORV users to negatively impact the beauty & diversity of native and migratory species which the park was designated to protect.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:52:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:52:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1417    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1418    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1419    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1422    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 @lease consider options to maximize the opportunity to preserve the birds and turtles on the cape seashore! Ther should be limitations onvehicle use that still allow those to access area without jeopardizing wildlife. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1423    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1428    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1432    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1433    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1434    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1435    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1436    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1437    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1438    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1439    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1440    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1441    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1442    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1443    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1444    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1445    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1446    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1447    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1448    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1449    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I have visited the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ever since I was a child. The bird watching in winter is exceptional, and the habitat for summer breeding birds, turtles and other animals is critical. My concerns have multiplied over the years because the human population has expanded to where there is very little habitat left.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1450    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1451    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 15:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1452    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1453    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1454    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1455    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1456    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:54:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. This cannot be stressed enough.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. These goals are extremely important to my family and friends, children and grandchildren.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1460    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 15:54:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1461    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Clark, Frank

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:04:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Just a quick prelude to my comment. What a system that brings an ethics challenged federal judge (at least 9 conflict of interest cases): enviro wacos who have apparently hijacked the old line environmental organizations: an inbred community (400 years of isolation, and culture before the island was connected to the world in 1962) of lifesavers, pirates, and scavengers; and a completely spineless NPS administration eager to do whatever will not create waves and notes in their personnel folders -- all making rules to restrict Americans from their Recreational Area. WOW  
Comments.

I feel that the rules on access and use of the seashore in the villages should stay as they currently are. ORV's ok september to May. Turtle nests fenced and restricted by the NPS. Monitoring and assistance to the hatchlings by the volunteer residents and NPS professionals. Storms scour the beaches in these areas from high tide line to the dunes, so I do not feel that additional waterfowl rules are appropriate. Additionally, the number of hatchlings killed by ORVs is in the hundredths of one percent. I believe it is 6 out of 98,000 hatchlings last year. Not a reason for ORV restrictions except at the nest. The huge restricted areas at Cape Point and South Beach under Option F are proposed only because the NPS has developed a "don't want to get out of my vehicle" attitude and would prefer to just close the whole \*\*\*\* thing. Lets bring the protective fences back to what is justified by good peer reviewed science. These areas should certainly be open during all non-nesting times.

Of the 21 Piping Plovers who have been killed by ORVs in the past 25 years, 19 of these were caused by federal vehicles. Perhaps driving lessons would help, but as indicated by the paragraph above, I have no problem with the smaller protective areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1462    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1463    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1464    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1465    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1466    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1467    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1468    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1469    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1470    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1471    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1472    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1473    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 16:23:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I want you to know that I thoroughly support stopping the ORV use at the beaches of the National Seashore at Cape Hatteras. My husband and I drove there in our Motor Home in April from our home in Door County and I was so disappointed with the bird life that we only stayed three days!  
I wondered how a National Seashore could be so called seeing the tracks of these vehicles over those pristine beaches where I hoped to see many shorebirds arriving from their southern wintering homes. How could turtles be safe to nest if these vehicles continued to be used everywhere? Only at the Visitor Center was there any real control over where people could go, and though that made it hard to see much of the birdlife (we found it hard to tote a telescope in our older age) we did see some species that made up for what the beaches lacked.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 16:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1476    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1478    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

0009176

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1479    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I often spend time birding at the beach, and I feel that the needs of birders and other visitors who enjoy the wildlife of Cape Hatteras should have access to the beach without the disturbance of ORVs. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1480    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
This even more critical given the oil spill off the coast of Mexico.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1481    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1482    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:23:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1483    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:23:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1484    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:23:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1485    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:23:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1486    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:23:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1487    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:23:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1488    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:23:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:23:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The top priorities for the park's final plan, should alternative D not be enacted, as described above should be:  
\* 1 --Put Natural Resources First. What good is a National Park or Seashore if its use destroys the natural resources and wildlife that the Park was created to protect? ORVs are utterly incompatible with that goal, so their use should be restricted to a place where they cannot damage wildlife, destroy dunes, and pollute park sand and air.  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park at all, the

amount of the beach open to them should be no greater than the proportion of visitors who come for the purpose of ORV use. Every time I have been to a beach that allows ORVs, I have feared for the safety of my grandchildren, and have had my own enjoyment of walking or sitting to enjoy the seashore ruined by the noise of the vehicles and the obnoxious, unsafe behavior and carelessness of the kinds of people who are attracted to that kind of entertainment.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery and implement greater restrictions and protective measures until recovery goals are met.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and hope you develop a much more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1491    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. THERE IS NO EXCUSE NOT PROTECT CAPE HATTERAS OR ANY OTHER PLACE. WE SHOULD NOT HAVE TO SAY OR BEG WITH COMMENTS THAT YOU ALLOW HUMANS TO DESTROY THE HABITAT FOR WILDLIFE. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1492    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1493    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1494    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1496    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1497    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Our seashores are vital to our wildlife. The number of birds that migrate each year has plummeted to such an extent that many songbirds, for example, are now rarely seen in New England. Warblers that drew many birders to the Green Mountains are absent. We must prioritize the importance of wildlife and take steps to protect them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1498    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. These species are fighting an uphill and critical battle for survival. Biodiversity is important to me and to the welfare of the planet and all its inhabitants. I want my children and grandchildren to inherit a planet that is rich and stable and full of the creatures that it had when I was born. Unfortunately, that is already impossible but it IS possible to conserve what we have left. Let's use our resources wisely and take care of the earth we have been given.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1502    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:23:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. ORV use is destructive to habitats while undermining the experience of those who want to enjoy quiet recreation such as walking, having a picnic, or wildlife watching. For these reasons, ORV use should be restricted to a limited area.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1503    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Yingling, Jacob T  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:30:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In reviewing Alternate F of the DEIS, please reconsider the 1,000 meter buffer required for Piping Plovers. A 1,000 meter buffer in all directions is excessive, and the NPS has not offered any evidence to support this recommendation. Reducing the closure to 300 meters in all directions would satisfy the needs of pedestrians and visitors to the Park, while still maintaining a safe barrier for the birds. Appropriate measures need to be taken to protect the habitat of endangered species, but please remember the dredge and spoil islands are available to use as nesting habitat. The FWS has had great results with the West Sister Island National Wildlife Refuge, as well as the Ottawa National Wildlife Refuge. Following models similar to these, and under guidance from the FWS and the Audubon society, a successful refuge could be created to increase the numbers of successfully fledged birds.

**Correspondence ID:** 1504    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1505    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1506    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. As a stakeholder and sea turtle rescuer for the last ten years I realize the precarious spot sea turtles nesting on our beaches are in since they have no voice. Protect the beaches from March to November; how hard is that?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1507    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1508    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This is not a time to have minimal beach and coastal area protection. We are about to see damage throughout the Caribbean coastal areas. We need a plan that would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The final plan, should provide for:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1509    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1510    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1511    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1512    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1513    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1514    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1515    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1516    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1517    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1518    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1519    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1520    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1521    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1522    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1523    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1524    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

0009191

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1526    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I'm sure i have passed on my comments on the subject of protecting our birds and turtles in Cape Hatteras National Seashore I support any protection that can be afforded. The same goes for our National Parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1527    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1528    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1529	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. ORV use should not be allowed within the park, year round to protect the wildlife and their habitat. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1530	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 16:53:26						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1531	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 16:53:26						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to</p>						

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Alternative D will provide more opportunity for non-ORV users like me and far less disturbance of wildlife which are very important to my enjoyment of the Seashore.  
If you don't choose Alternative D, at least provide me with as much right to undisturbed access as ORV users get to disturb my access.  
Always when managing a national treasure such as the Seashore, protection of the natural resources and wildlife MUST COME FIRST. Design recreational use around protection of the resources. The preferred plan does not set aside enough areas free of ORV use year round nor does it provide enough buffering for wildlife. Clearly breeding birds and nesting sea turtles need space. Please give it to them!  
Please think bigger. Numbers of wildlife there are so low, a plan must include real recovery. Set goals and management for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Good wildlife management is paramount for good National Seashore management. Anything else is C- management.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1533    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1534    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 16:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1535    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1536    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I do not consider that motorized "recreation" should be allowed in any National Park. There are plenty of other places where those who are enamored of the internal combustion engine can have at it. Valuable wildlife habitat is NOT one of those places and should be protected from the destruction and noise of that activity.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1537    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 16:53:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1548    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1552    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Back when we took our children down to Cape Hatteras on vacation in the '70's, your park was an unspoiled paradise. Two of us were birders and we enjoyed so much all the species that we found there. I do not remember any ORV usage back then. The beaches were used for fishing and swimming and picnics.

In 1994 I made another visit to your park and found quite a change. There was ORV usage scattered along the beach, which must have disturbed the nesting of plovers & turtles. Since then I have read that your park is being destroyed by people who do not care about the wildlife and the habitats at all! Something has to be done to protect what is left of Cape Hatteras and to try to bring back what has been destroyed.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. As a society, we have already dramatically reduced wildlife populations and this effect on the ecology of our nation and planet has substantial repercussions for our own species. The stability of all life depends on our protection of this wildlife. Thus even if we only want to be selfish, our own protection depends on the protection of wildlife and health ecosystems. As a family physician, I am acutely aware of the need for a healthy environment for my patients and all people.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1559    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1560    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1561    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1562    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 17:23:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1565	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 17:23:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1566	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 17:23:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I have visited Cape Hatteras National Seashore and know it to be a sensitive area. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1567	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 17:23:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						

STOP air, water and environmental pollution!

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1568    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1569    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1570    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:23:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\*Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\*Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1571    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:25:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir, Madam -

I am a kitesurfer.

Each year I am going to visit North Carolina (Hatteras) for kitesurf. I now understand there is a proposal to restrict kitesurfing/beach access in the area. May I urge you to take a minimalist approach in this regard. Kitesurfing is a relatively environmentally friendly sport involving the consumption of no hydrocarbons during the activity (obviously one usually needs to drive to and from locations).

The concern about disturbance to birds by kites is in my view way overdone. As a practitioner of the sport for many years I have seen a huge variety of species co-existing with kites with apparently no ill effect whatsoever. Is there any evidence at all of long-lasting adverse effects on bird life from kites? Lastly, I would point out that the US (like the UK) has an obesity and inactivity crisis. Environmental protection should be balanced against the positive benefits of encouraging participation in sports and making the facilities (including beaches) available to do so.

I do hope you will keep Hatteras' beaches open and available for use and I look forward to being able to visit them.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Yours faithfully,  
Jocelyne Mercille jomercille@hotmail.com

**Correspondence ID:** 1572    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:38:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with the Coalition for Beach access position statement on the DEIS

**Correspondence ID:** 1573    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:47:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam, I am an avid recreational beach and water user. We vacationed up in the Cape Hatteras area a few years ago and loved its diversity. I am an avid sailor (mostly laser dinghys) and kiteboarder. I enjoy running along the beach and playing in the waves with my family. I get great enjoyment from quietly walking the coastal areas, both beach and wetlands, and observing and photographing the birds and other wildlife in these areas. I live close to the National Seashore areas along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, east of Pensacola Fl. Previously I lived in Colorado and enjoyed both the quiet and solitude of the many Wilderness Areas that had very restrictive access regulations, and the national forest and park areas where ORVs, bikes, boaters and hikers all shared access.

I think that limiting non-motorized access within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore (and any National Seashore) should be a very last resort. Seasonal limitations of various forms of access when there are documented significant populations of Federally Endangered bird species nesting is reasonable IF there is good scientific evidence showing that the limitations actually improve the population (or that the presence of people has a negative impact on the population).

I am supportive of reasonable restrictions on motorized access (ORV) to beaches and environmentally sensitive areas. In our area one must be a full-time resident of Walton County in order to obtain a beach vehicle pass.

I support Alternative C as being the best compromise as it adequately provides for the protection of Endangered Species during their critical nesting periods, yet provides the most recreational access to this precious resource.

I would further ask that kiteboarding's effect on nesting species be studied. I have not seen birds scared off by kites flying in their proximity or overhead, but I have also mostly been kiteboarding around species that are fairly used to being around human activity.

I also request that you place an emphasis on providing pedestrian access near and around the SMAs. This is done at our local National Seashore, where there are a series of spring-fed lakes just behind the dune lines. There is a narrow access down to the beach along one edge, and the entire length of beach, along an inlet and out around to the gulf side is open to non-motorized activities, including fishing, kiteboarding, kayaking and picnicking. The lakes and wetlands areas are all off-limits to protect the birds' habitat.

thank-you for providing me this opportunity to comment. Best regards Richard (Mike) Stoughton

**Correspondence ID:** 1574    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1575    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 17:53:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This would enable non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1576    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 17:53:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1577    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 17:53:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1578    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1580    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1581    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1582    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife. BOTH of these are extremely important to me, as are all of the principles listed below..

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1583    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1591    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1592    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1593    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1594    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. People who use ORVs have no interest in protecting wildlife and should use those vehicles only in areas where they can't be destructive to nature.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1595    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1596    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1597    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1598    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Dear Superintendent Murray, I would like to take the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I totally support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. Our wildlife need the help they can get with the declining numbers and habitat they are facing.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. The noise alone from these ORV's is reason enough to restrict their use in National Parks. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 17:53:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:01:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** "Shenandoah and Yellowstone National Parks closed eight months of the year due to recently-enacted law to protect a non-endangered Pileated Woodpecker." Is that true? What if it was true? Wouldn't you wonder if it was a joke or how anyone could reach such a wide-reaching decision that affects so many people? That's what I'm wondering and why I DISAGREE with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

To be clear, I can find no basis for any decisions being made in this 800 page declaration. I see no peer-reviewed science, a mandatory item for all credible decisions. What I see are faulty decisions based on faulty science. Where are the objective experts supporting this document and these beach closures? Where are the two primary purposes of ORV Management Plans addressed; 1) The protection of resources without impairment to and from the visiting public, and, 2) the protection of traditional culture, recreation, and commercial value of the public with limited disruption? What I see in this document is almost nothing except the considerations of the populations of migratory (and very mobile) birds and turtles. I see the killing of many animals (natural predators) in the name of protecting a non-endangered bird that may or may not nest on Hatteras Island (see the "mobile" comment above).

I have many specific concerns, but below are the primary ones. For any closures listed below or areas considered or excluded in any bird studies, I'm concerned that there is no credible science on which to make any decisions, especially decisions that will further affect the people and wildlife of Hatteras Island. Why would such decisions be based on faulty bird counts, science without peer review, or without a truly independent group conducting such studies? Some concerns-

1- To Be Closed Year Round: Hatteras Inlet, North End Ocracoke Island, Ramp 27-Ramp 30. Why? Where is the proof that this area should be closed (for birds? what birds? at what cost? why year-round?).

2- Why do non-endangered or non threatened species like Oystercatchers get so much area closed for them? They are being used for closing more area every year! Many miles of ORV-accessible beaches are closed already and should not be. When you have migratory (and generally mobile) animals like birds, where is the proof that this one spot warranted closure? 3- Large, inflexible buffers up to 1000 meters for piping plovers! Why is there an area blocked off at all? Where is the science supporting that these plovers are entitled to any area at all? Where is the proof they aren't breeding in large numbers at some areas outside of the park (you can see them on the smaller islands all over the place)? What about the impact on the island economy and the heritage of the islanders/visitors, who love visiting the beaches? Even if the plovers need space, why so much and why build in a penalty for everyone, if there is a crime committed (breaking down barriers/signs, for instance)? We don't make an entire neighborhood suffer if one house gets buglarized. Why apply a penalty?!

4- NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem. This includes dredge and spoil islands that have less predator presence. Why are they ignoring such spots? It's obvious to those who live on the island and visit it often that many birds have moved their breeding away from spots with predators and flooding. These dredge and spoil islands are perfect for them. Again, this points to the faulty science being applied to this important decision.

5- NPS will NOT adopt more proactive techniques used at other east coast locations to encourage turtle nesting success??? Why not?! We love the

turtles and want to continue to enjoy them.

6- Why is it OK to tamper with nature in some instances but not others? NPS: OK to set aside areas of beach to "extirpated" sea beach amaranth, but not OK to clear vegetation at Cape Point ponds to create more favorable piping plover habitat (outside of the prime ORV corridor)!

7- "...Prohibition of PETS in the seashore during bird breeding season, including in front of the villages." This means no pets in public areas-beaches, campgrounds, sound-front, foot trails, park maintained roads from March 15 -July 31. This is outrageous. We already have leash laws in place. Why place this unnecessary restriction on the many pet-loving visitors and owners on the island?! This will just further erode the island economy and quality of life.

8- How is it okay to kill predators (greatest risk to birds and turtles)? The NPS makes the decision to protect plovers and oystercatchers based on faulty science (saving animals that are in greater numbers in other more safe areas), while deciding to play "God" and kill hundreds to thousands of smaller predators (killing animals that are land-bound on the island). How does this make sense?!!

9- Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the OVERWHELMING majority of negative impact will be felt by the small businesses in the seashore villages rather than by overall economic interests within the region of influence (ROI). This island depends on its tourism. It's culture has changed over the years from commercial fishing to service industry and tourism. Driving on the beach is a necessity and a right of the people of our country. We have handicapped relatives, cannot carry beach trip gear over the expansive beaches, etc. without being able to drive on the beaches. By and large, those of us who drive on the beaches of the island take great care of it, picking up trash that has washed up, avoiding any wildlife, etc. Taking that away from us would be a tragedy and just wrong.

The National Environmental Policy Act sets out to preserve historical, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage on the island. If anyone is to make any decisions to close any beaches, it must be done based on solid peer-reviewed science and with input from all parties (not just the environmental groups, as has been the case lately).

Keep our beaches open until a proper study has been conducted over many years and after a group of all stakeholders have agreed to the best way to manage this great resource.

**Correspondence ID:** 1610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1611    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1612    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Alternative D would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. For too many years, the interests of ORV groups, which represent just a small, but very vocal, percentage of Cape Hatteras visitors, have outweighed the interests of the two million people that visit this dynamic seashore every year. As the Park Service's DEIS points out, what is decided now will guide what happens at Cape Hatteras for decades and will set a precedent for other national parks.

Some local citizens who vocally advocate for beach driving have implied that only they have a valid opinion about how Cape Hatteras is managed, labeling others as "outsiders." The National Park Service needs to know that people all over the country support management at their national parks that balances recreation and wildlife protections over the demands of one special interest group.

Unregulated beach driving has taken its toll. As a unit of the National Park system, Cape Hatteras has been required for decades under federal law to establish ORV guidelines that minimize harm to wildlife and natural values of the Seashore in accordance with the best available science.

If the Park Service does not choose Alternate D, the following principles should be the basis of its final plan:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1613    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1617    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1618    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1619    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1620    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1621    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1622    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1624    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1628    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1629    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1630    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1631    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Parks should be managed for wildlife and humans who visit should fall into a category of NON-DISTURBANCE to them. ORVs and motorized vehicles do not belong on beaches. Beaches are homes to wildlife. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

I have been to Cape Hatteras and visited and spent my tourism dollars for wildlife viewing. I would return if there were still historical numbers of birds and animals remaining. Please consider the opinions of all constituents, not just the most vocal or those who spend the most to lobby for their proposals. Thank you for listening. I know this is a controversial issue in some ways.

**Correspondence ID:** 1633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am honored and feel it is also my duty to comment on the National Park service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National seashore. I grew up on the beach. When I was young the sea and the shore were teeming with life. So much so that I kidded myself into thinking it would never change. More people , more pollution, more traffic and no conservation. Now, where I grew up, the ocean is still beautiful but it is only skin deep. Beneath the waves the schools of fish are gone, shells rarely are washed ashore and on shore the sandpipers are a rarity rather than a daily sight. The turtles no longer come to our beach. I no longer go there either. For me the beauty of the sea was not just the lapping waves but the chance to intermingle with with another world. That world is imperiled.

Because of this I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide a little more pedestrian access, of all the alternative plans presented in the draft of the environmental impact statement.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1634    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1635    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1636    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, most of the beach should still be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. This approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. This is of utmost importance, as our irreplaceable wildlife is already under severe stress due to a variety of human activities.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
In fact, my concern for wildlife is so great that I am happy with Alternative D even if not modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1637    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1639    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1640    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:23:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to us.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:36:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the beaches in Hatteras open for me and my family to enjoy! We come every year, sometimes several trips a year. We love to rent a big beach house with my mom and her partner, and both of my brothers and their families. We pack-up our 4 wheel drive vehicles and head to the beach everyday. We love to go to different areas and find just the perfect 'hole' to swim and fish in. Please know that we are very respectful of the birds and turtles. Also, we make sure our vehicles do not have any oil leaks or anything that could be damaging to the environment we love and enjoy. I know there are disrespectful beach drivers out there. One of life's great lessons is to not let a few ruin it for the many! Keep the beaches open and we will keep coming to Hatteras AND enjoying, as well as respecting our time there. Thank you, Shannon Kisiel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 18:53:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 18:53:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1645    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

I am hoping that Plan D will be followed. I am disturbed about the senseless tearing up of the beaches, plants, and the scaring away of the wildlife. Not only that, but ORVs are polluting the air with their fumes and wasting gasoline. I don't enjoy the noise and fumes when I am quietly birdwatching.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1646    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1647    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1648    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1649    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 18:53:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1650    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 18:53:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1651    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29.2010 18:53:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

I hope you'll decide to go for the preferred route, which serves the greater good without any doubt.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1652    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Alternative D represents a much better balance in use of the beaches. ORV use disrupts the beaches both for all other people visiting as well as creating significant disturbances for wildlife.

In the event that the park does not enact Alternative D, I believe it should still be sure to incorporate the following components:

Prohibit ORVs from at least half of the seashore year-round. ORV users are only a small percentage of our population, and when they have the run of beaches, it discourages others from visiting, especially families with children and nature lovers. Pedestrians deserve to be able to safely enjoy our parks. With more area protected from ORV traffic, wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

The National Seashore is key to the survival of many species of breeding, migrating, and overwintering wildlife. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

The park's plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1653    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1654    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1655    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1656    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1657    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1658    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1659    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1660    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1661    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1662    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1663    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1664    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1665    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1666    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1667    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
If the National Park Service can't protect wildlife who will?  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1668    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1669    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1670    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 18:53:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1671    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 18:53:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1672    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. ORVs should only be allowed on 16 miles of the beach, if at all. The proposal does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half, if not more of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Our national parks should be a quiet refuge for people and wildlife! Please take these comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1673    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1674    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1675    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 18:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1676	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 18:53:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1677	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 18:53:39						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1678	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Molinaro, James						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 19:03:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am canceling my planned vacation to the Frisco area due to the restrictions on beach access and the pet restrictions. My pet is never off of the leash and I will not be adding about 2500.00 to the economy of the villages. Please think about the people not the Birds let mother nature take care of them she has been doing a pretty good job.						

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1682    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, more than half of the 68 miles of beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1683    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 19:23:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1684    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 19:23:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1685    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1686    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1687    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1688    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1689    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1690    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1691    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1692    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1693    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1694    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1695    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1699    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1700    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1701    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1702    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1706    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1707    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1708    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1709    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1710    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The shore birds and sea turtles deserve our protection and individuals deserve to be able to enjoy the beach without the noise and disruption of ORV's racing around them.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1711    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1712    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1713    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1714    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:23:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1715    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1716    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife. The wildlife are, in my opinion, the critical issue and the plan should be created with them foremost in our minds.  
Should you choose not to enact Alternative D, which would be a mistake in my opinion, please maintain the following priorities:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and strongly encourage you to work toward a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
I believe a national park or seashore should be a place to enjoy recreation in relative peace and observation of the natural scenery. Allowing ORVs on the national seashore disrupts visitors activities, such as walking along or sitting on the beach and surrounding areas.  
It has devastating effects on wildlife such as sea turtles, other organisms, and birds, particularly the endangered piping plover.  
In addition, I wouldn't be surprised if the vehicles disrupt the natural geologic coastal processes of the fragile barrier island.  
Please protect the Hatteras National Seashore for the public to use. I am aware these restrictions would mean the park service is not serving the needs of all the public, but the great majority deserve not to suffer their experience for such a small minority.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1727    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1728    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1729    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1730    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:53:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1731	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						
	Remember, the shore birds and sea turtles were here long before four wheelers were invented. Eco tourism is a booming business and conservation minded seashore users would respect the wildlife, and at the same time use less polluting means of sightseeing. The more pristine yet accessible areas are at the seashore, the more the local economy will benefit from increased tourism. Your staffing requirements would lessen over the long term, because walking hikers are alot less in need of emergency medical personnel than the people on ORV's.						
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:						
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.						
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.						
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.						
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1732	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	THE GULF OF MEXICO OIL SPILL IS DEVASTATING TO OCEAN SPECIES--PLANT LIFE, PHYTOPLANKTON, SHORE BIRDS, TURTLES AND FISH--PROBABLY WHALES, TOO. IT WILL SOON FOUL BEACHES, WETLANDS and ESTUARIES. DON'T OPEN CAPE HATTERAS AND OTHER NATIONAL PARKS TO NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION. WILDLIFE ARE TRAUMATIZED ENOUGH ALREADY!						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:						
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.						
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.						
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.						
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1733    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1734    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1735    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1736    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1737    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1738    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1739    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1740    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1741    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1742    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1743    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1744    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1745    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1746    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 19:54:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1747    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1748    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1749    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors.  
\* Put Natural Resources First.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.  
I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1750    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1751    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Motorized recreation is at odds with most other uses of the beach.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1752    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1753    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1754    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 Off road vehicles are disruptive to both people and wildlife, and their use in the National Parks should be minimized if not banned outright. I urge you to adopt the most restrictive policy with regards to ORV use on Cape Hatteras to protect the park and its visitors.  
 Thank you for considering my views on this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1755    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1756    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1757    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1758    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1759    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1760    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:23:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1761    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1762    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 In fragile areas along seashores encouraging more gently foot travel helps sustain the plants and animals that depend on these areas for food and reproduction. Many ORV users, too often, use the land as a challenge course - they are not visiting to view the plants and animals. I urge you to help sustain the ecosystems still present in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore by promoting less ORV use and encouraging people to walk along the beaches thus reducing the stress on wildlife.  
 Please support alternative D and incorporate the following principles in your final plan: 1) ORVs should be limited to specific areas (less than 50%) of the beach area with the other 50% allotted to foot travel. This is a more equitable balance within the park for various users. 2) Most important: stewardship of the natural resources and wildlife should guide and dictate where, when and how people activities take place. Any recreational use must continue protection for the resources not lead to their demise. 3) Wildlife protection and continued reproductive viability must be based on the best scientific information available. 4) Consider increasing the wildlife disturbance buffers especially in areas where sea turtles lay their eggs and the young must return to the sea and also to protect breeding birds. 5) Clear goals for wildlife recovery must be established. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

I hope and pray we can rise to the task and make a difference.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1767    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

0009273

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1774    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 20:36:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Martin, Drew  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 20:40:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.  
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 20:53:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1777    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. 95% on the shore birds feeding and nesting along the Delaware Bay in New Jersey have disappeared over the past 50 or so years, mostly due to close proximity of vehicles and people through the years. Please don't let that happen in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1778    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1779    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1780    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1781    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Is it possible to develop exciting trails elsewhere for the ORVs? Seems to me that the (one) noisy, destructive group should not get to ruin the solitude and fun for the (two) wild life and nature-lovers groups. Majority rules!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1784    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The chance to preserve this habitat for the future should not be missed. We have lost so much vital seashore along the eastern US seaboard, habitat that the life of so many creatures have relied on for thousands of years. With this drastic habitat loss in the relatively recent past we owe it to the future generations of humans, red knots and all the creatures that depend on this seashore instead of allowing a very small amount of people render it virtually sterile in comparison to what it could and should be.  
Thank you, Jim Dugan New Milford, CT

**Correspondence ID:** 1785    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Regarding the National Park Service's plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras N.S.: I have been involved in the preservation of the snowy Plover on the Washington coast and know from first hand experience that vehicles destroy nesting habitat for birds on beaches. I urge you to implement alternative D.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1786    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1787    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1788    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1789    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1790    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1791    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:53:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1792    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1793    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1794    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1795    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1799    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1800    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Future generations will thank us for protecting our wildlife and natural landscapes. Thank you again.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1801    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1802    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1803    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
My wife and I have spent many vacations and many dollars vacationing on the outer banks. The few negatives experiences we have had have involved ORVs. There is too much access open to ORVs and we would like to see it reduced. They make for an unpleasant beach experience and negatively impact the bird populations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 20:54:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 20:54:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. Although I am a resident of Oregon, my mother has lived for many years in Edenton, NC, and I visit Cape Hatteras for birding regularly.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:23:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I have visited Cape Hatteras many times, and consider it an amazing national treasure. Please protect this treasure.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1807    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:23:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
There are places that must never be ruined by off road vehicles. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches

and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:23:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1809    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:23:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1810    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:23:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1811    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:23:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1812    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:23:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1813    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:24:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1814    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:24:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1815    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:24:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1816    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:24:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1817    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:24:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:24:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:24:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

The environment and preserving wildlife should always come before the desires of people who want to use Our National Parks for recreational purposes that are detrimental to the land. There is no reason why someone HAS to drive on the beach. Just because they've always done it doesn't make it right. People using the beach shouldn't have to worry about getting run over or breathing noxious gas fumes or listen to the sound of motors as the cars kick up sand when they go by.

Birds and other wildlife use the beaches for raising their young, for sustenance and we humans should be allowed the privilege of observing the wildlife without worrying about someone running over nests and destroying habitat.

Let nature take her course, please don't allow a few motorheads to rule, to the demise of our natural, beautiful and necessary resources. We need to save what's left, not run over it and pulverize it until it resembles concrete. YUK!

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1821    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:24:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:24:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:24:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:24:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:24:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:24:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.29,2010 21:24:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:24:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lysell, Donald K  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:48:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To allow the closing of the access to the beaches is nothing more than the government bowing to the wishes of minority organizations and the denial of free use of the beaches which was promised when the Park services took control of the beaches and promised continuous access. As a handicapped fisherman the only way I can fish is to be able to drive on the beach. These are the same type of tactics used by Germany in WWII. The park service is now acting like the Gestapo for the US government.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:53:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
I was born in North Carolina and have fond memories of the Cape Hatteras Seashore. I am a birdwatcher and remember seeing American Oystercatcher and Gull-billed Tern. I believe that studies have shown drastic declines in the populations of many birds that use the open beach during part of the year. I believe that the National Seashore at Cape Cod closes the beach during the Piping Plover breeding season and it is working. Please try to save the wildness of this area by restricting the driving of ORVs on the beach. This National Seashore should provide recreation for all Americans not just fishermen.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:53:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:53:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:53:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife. It's important to allow wildlife to breed without disturbance and harassment from humans.

I believe the following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for listening. I will be monitoring the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and looking forward to a fair and equitable final plan for all visitors: one that better protects all of the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:53:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:53:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:53:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:53:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:53:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1844    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 21:54:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1845    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:23:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1846    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:23:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1847    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
\*\*\*Cape Hatteras is a National Seashore, not an ORV recreation area. If ORV users wish a place to play with their toys, there are plenty of places in eastern North Carolina within reasonable day-trip distance, including various bumper-car tourist attractions. If they wish a place to see a National Seashore that preserves the natural world resembling how it existed prior to human occupation, they can leave their machines at home and come to Cape Hatteras.\*\*\*  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1848    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:23:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:23:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 22:23:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Let's help birds and turtles survive in an increasingly intrusive and hostile world.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

Too few people are taking a stand to save our wildlife! Please don't be part of that group. We need you to take a stand to save our endangered birds, turtles and other wildlife. Leave these to be enjoyed by our children, grandchildren and future generations.

The Cape Hatteras Seashore is one of many endangered areas within our borders. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Save the seashore and save the animals and birds for your grandchildren...they have not even had a chance to experience them yet!

**Correspondence ID:** 1852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 22:23:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:23:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:23:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please be a leader in providing adequate protection for shore birds and sea turtles! Managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore would be a giant step forward if the environmentally preferred alternative D impact statement is selected and further modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are very important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1856	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. Mechanized, high speed, high noise level activities do not seem to me to be compatible with the enjoyment of a natural environment. There are few places left where one is not bombarded by high levels of noise and activity -National Parks and Seashores should be allowed to be natural, quiet, and undisturbed as far as possible while permitting access for all persons. Some mechanical access is necessary to allow people with disabilities and the elderly to enjoy the environment, but it can be permitted with low noise levels so as not to disturb everyone else. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1857	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 22:53:54						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

**Correspondence ID:** 1858    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:53:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1859    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:53:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

The situation in the Gulf only makes this a more important issue!!

**Correspondence ID:** 1860    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:53:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1861    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 ORVs damage the environment and spoil natural beauty wherever they are permitted. ORVs cause noise and air pollution, promote erosion and, most of all, are not safe under any circumstances to their riders or anyone else in their vicinity, let alone the wildlife they negatively impact.  
 As a healthcare professional, I've cared for several ORV operators and passengers in the hospital. Their injuries are frequently life threatening or disabling. Based on my experience caring for the operators in the hospital as well as encountering them on public property, they are usually inebriated at the time they are operating an ORV. Most ORV operators are rude, loud and inconsiderate, just like their machines.  
 ORVs should not be permitted on any public land anywhere at anytime for any reason ever. They should be uniformly banned, period. The overwhelming majority of Americans go to our public lands to enjoy their natural beauty and wildlife. ORVs only detract from this experience and endanger God's creatures that He put there to begin with.  
 I absolutely will not stand for the continued use of my tax dollars to fund the active destruction of our natural resources, degradation of the environment, and disrespect for nature in general. It is time for all of this ORV nonsense to stop immediately.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1862    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1863    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 22:54:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1865	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 22:54:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1866	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 23:23:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1867	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 23:23:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1868	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 23:23:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1869	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 23:23:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1870	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 23:23:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1871	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 23:24:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1872	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.29.2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. A national seashore, in my opinion, does not solely exist for the pleasure of one group - like off road vehicle users. National priorities are at stake here, like preserving endangered birds, plants, and habitat. Off road vehicles can be very destructive in a very short period of time - their use needs to be severely curtailed when the needs of all Americans are threatened. A "national" seashore belongs to all of us, not just one group with big destructive machines. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1873	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 23:24:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1874    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 23:53:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1875    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 23:53:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1876    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.29,2010 23:53:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 00:23:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1878    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 00:54:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 I do not like off road vehicles. They are loud and smelly and awful.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1879    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 00:54:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1880    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:54:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
I have been privileged to see nesting Snowy Plovers protected on Sanibel. Please help these and other endangered species by protecting their habitat. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1881    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:54:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1882    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

0009308

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1883    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1884    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1885    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1886    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 01:23:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1887    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 01:23:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1888    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 01:54:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 01:54:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 01:54:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1891    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

I'm sure that a little bit of research would show you that the percentage of those wanting to use ORV's is minuscule in comparison with the numbers of those who want to view our natural areas in as non-invasive manner as possible. Why would you even consider catering to a small group of users, and more importantly the corporations manufacturing and promoting ORVs, when it means the evident destruction of wildlife and the destruction of their necessary habitat?

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1892    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 01:54:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1893    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 02:24:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1894    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 02:24:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1895    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 02:24:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1896    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 02:54:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

I hope Cape Hatteras never has to face what our Louisiana coastline is now facing. Off-road vehicles should never be on beaches, but neither should oil slicks.

**Correspondence ID:** 1897    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 02:54:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1898    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 03:24:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1899    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 03:24:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1900    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 03:24:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1901    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 03:54:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1902    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan (D) would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I remember a family visit to the Outer Banks in the '50's when we parked off the provided aircraft landing-screens at our peril. It was clear even then that there was a great requirement to protect the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, if it had been defined then.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1903    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 04:24:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1904    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 04:24:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1905    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 04:24:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1906    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 04:24:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1907    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 04:54:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

I support your management of our national parks that balances recreation and wildlife protections over the demands of one special interest group.

Destructive recreation is unacceptable.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1908    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 04:54:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1909    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 04:54:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1910    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 04:54:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1911    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I am an author of children's books about biomes, including seashores. So I know quite a bit about their ecology and dynamics. Driving on beaches is just plain destructive. There are plenty of denuded, secondary habitats in this country where people can drive and have fun. Why spoil a wonderful habitat that still has ecological value? With so much industrial development already squeezing out wildlife, why damage this piece of the Outer Banks?  
Driving on a beach is like letting people drive along sidewalks. It just does not work.  
I have seen newly hatched sea turtles struggle to climb out of beach tracks. I've seen eggs and creatures crushed by vehicles on beaches. I've seen mother sea turtles, at night, crawl back into the sea after pulling themselves on shore, just because of noise from vehicles.  
We spend a lot on roads in this country. There are dumps and dirt roads and lots of waste areas for four wheeling fun and bouncing along in jeeps. People do not need to do this on beaches. Taking away the driving option will actually provide people with a new experience: um, walking! If there's anything we Americans need it is to remember how to enjoy the outdoors with our physical bodies, i.e. to be physically active without noisy machines that prevent us from exercise.  
Also, the National Park System is paid for by citizens NATIONALLY. Not locally. As a citizen of this country, I want these beaches protected for the general benefit of all, not a few joy riders. I am for fun, but not if it has this kind of huge impact on our wildlife and the future of habitats. Below are more details suggested by Audubon. But, frankly, I think that all the beaches should be free of vehicles. No reason to compromise.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1912    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 04:54:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
In all decision making it's imperative to consider the impact on the environment. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is one of our country's treasures and all and any attempts to alter access to pedestrians should be carefully decided with primary consideration of impact of change on wildlife and vegetation.  
Please acts with care and sensitivity to this crucial issue which does and will affect us all. I am struck by the plan's acronym, DEIS, because the Latin, DEUS, is a word that is about the divine.  
What IS divine in our lives, is the appreciation of these beautiful natural resources and our mandate to preserve and love them, exhibiting great care and sensitivity towards making these resources available for public use but also safe, with safety for wilderness always first in our minds. We do know that influx of people does, inevitably, degrade the environment, so the task is to walk that delicate tight rope that is preservation while impacting people in so many ways, and vice versa.  
Life itself seems to hang in this delicate balance and we are gifted that job, of doing it, with "heart".

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1913    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:24:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If common sense rules, there is no other alternative that makes more sense than Alternative A, "No Action"! It is all about the people and the local people on Hatteras Island are most important. They are speaking loudly and clearly that their constitutional rights are being violated by a small minority that are well funded and found some loop holes to pursue with our legal system, which is way out of control. Sanity must rule here so we can enjoy the beaches in the past (live in harmony with nature and it has worked great before!) and stop negatively affecting businesses and properties on Hatteras Island. For God sakes, the great majority of people just want the Federal Govt to 'cool it" and back off. If it is not broke, don't fix it! Ted Bright, Property Owner in Avon, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1914    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:24:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love the beach, and I love driving on the beach, it used to be a matter of convince,(keeping an eye on the truck,not having to walk with all your gear.). But now it is a necessity,my wife is dissabled and cannot walk any distance on the sand. My wife loves the outer banks, and loves to fish, but closing beach access,not only hurts people like my wife,but hurts the the economy of the outer banks. I have met meny people who come from out of state(VA,MAR,PA) to camp, and drive on the baech. People have been driving on the banks since the Right brothers time! the birds have delt with it since then, they are smart enough not to build the nests where the trucks are driving every day! thank you for your time, Bruce Clay

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1915    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:28:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1916    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:28:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1917    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:28:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1918    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:28:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1919    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:28:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
We need to stop imperiling our biological heritage. I derive great satisfaction from knowing these creatures are extant and in healthy populations. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1920    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:28:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1921    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:28:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:28:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1923    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:28:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1924    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1925    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1926    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1927    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1928    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1929    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1936    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 05:59:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1937    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1938    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1939    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1940    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

0009327

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1941    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Thank you for helping to protect one of our nation's most precious resources . . . its wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1942    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1943    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1944    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1945    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

I visited Cape Hatteras NS with my husband three years ago and it was difficult to find a section of beach that did not have cars driving on it. We were really disappointed, and could hardly believe this was happening on National Park lands! This really reduced our enjoyment of the park and I can only figure that it is stressful for the shorebirds. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, where ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife is ridiculous- why should people using ORVs be able to subject everyone else to their noise and disruption! How did they get to take over this part that belongs to the public? If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach, but preferably more should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide more balanced access for all visitors. Visitors could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. Many other National Parks do such a good job on this-- why has Cape Hatteras been treated so differently? The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use YEAR ROUND for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers are probably too small to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

The plan should include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery, including migrating and wintering species as well as breeding species.

Management targets in the DEIS should be based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on the current disturbed conditions.

Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1949    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

BLESSED ARE THE MERCIFUL FOR THEY SHALL RECEIVE MERCY

**Correspondence ID:** 1950    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:59**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1951    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:28:59**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1952    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:29:06**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1953    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:29:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1954    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:29:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1955    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:29:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1956    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:44:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Good morning Mr. Murray,  
 In reference to the proposed pet policy, How many birds have been harrassed, injured or killed by a dog on a six foot leash? I would suspect zero. If the park rangers would enforce the current rules for pets, banning them from the beach would not be neccessary during bird breeding season (page 136 of the DEIS).  
 Respectfully, Dave Farmer

**Correspondence ID:** 1957    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more oppportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1958    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more oppportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1959    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more oppportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1960    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1961    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1962    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1963    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:59:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:59:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1965    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 06:59:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Please add my name to the supporters of Alternative D. Protection of wildlife and the rights of people who prefer activities other than ORV use have been given short shrift, and this imbalance must be redressed.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

0009335

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1966    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Meacham, William C

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:26:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Theodore Roosevelt said when he created Yosemite Natl Park that it was "A Land for all People". A very simple thought in these not so simple times. What it tells me is that lands such as the Outer Banks should be preserved for the People with a balance also protecting the wildlife and land. The options of full access all the time to people and ORV is not acceptable as is the option to ban all people and ORV's all the time. The key is to find a balance between nature and people. I am on the side of giving people and ORV's access to the beaches, yet I want the land preserved for wildlife and future generations. I don't think TR would have wanted a full boycott of people from the park. I think he would have wanted a compromise (as we have now) to give access of the land to the people. There are powerful lobbies and forces working totally against the people presently. They are more organized and better funded. It is up to the wisdom of the NPS to follow through and develop, promote an option that fulfills the wishes of the man that created the NPS - A Land for all People.

Thank you for your time and consideration Bill Meacham

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1967    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1968    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1969    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1970    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1971    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1972    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1973    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1974    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1975    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1976    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1977    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1978    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1979    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30.2010 07:29:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1980    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30.2010 07:29:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1981    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30.2010 07:29:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1982    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:29:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Alternative plan D appears to provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. We need to protect our natural world now as much as is humanly possible, sine we have done such a fantastic job of despoiling it up to this point!  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:30:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

I saw what protections on the florida beaches did. I was a sea turtle nesting survey and recovery person for many years in the '80s. Protection not only worked, it brought in many more tourists to see the turtles return to sea.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1985    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:30:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1986    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:30:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1987    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:30:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1988	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 07:39:49					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS, I disagree with the DEIS. The impact economically to Cape Hatteras will be devastating. I can not believe 1000 m buffer zones for non-native piping plovers. This is unnecessary and excessive. There needs to be surfzone access and open corridors. The Deis is unfair! This is suppose to be a recreational areaI agree with management but this Deis is not fair and balanced.I think if the NPS chooses alternative F the people should sue.I think the people of Cape Hatteras and the United States are more then willing to compromise but the DEIS is one sided. The NPS needs to do the right thing. Listen to the comments.Be fair.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1989	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 07:39:59					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS, I disagree with the DEIS. The impact economically to Cape Hatteras will be devastating. I can not believe 1000 m buffer zones for non-native piping plovers. This is unnecessary and excessive. There needs to be surfzone access and open corridors. The Deis is unfair! This is suppose to be a recreational areaI agree with management but this Deis is not fair and balanced.I think if the NPS chooses alternative F the people should sue.I think the people of Cape Hatteras and the United States are more then willing to compromise but the DEIS is one sided. The NPS needs to do the right thing. Listen to the comments.Be fair.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1990	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 07:40:05					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS, I disagree with the DEIS. The impact economically to Cape Hatteras will be devastating. I can not believe 1000 m buffer zones for non-native piping plovers. This is unnecessary and excessive. There needs to be surfzone access and open corridors. The Deis is unfair! This is suppose to be a recreational areaI agree with management but this Deis is not fair and balanced.I think if the NPS chooses alternative F the people should sue.I think the people of Cape Hatteras and the United States are more then willing to compromise but the DEIS is one sided. The NPS needs to do the right thing. Listen to the comments.Be fair.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1991	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 07:59:21					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1992	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 07:59:21					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.					

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1993	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 07:59:32						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1994	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 07:59:32						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1995	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 07:59:32						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:59:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1997    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:59:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1998    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:59:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 1999    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 07:59:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 2000    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife and beach goers, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. As someone who loves the beach, this does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. I believe the only ORV use allowed within the park should be for persons that are handicapped and parents with small children. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and other seashores and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.